Calendar No. 312

100TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
100–159

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1988

SEPTEMBER 16, 1987.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2700]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2700) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1988

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$16,149,998,000
Budget estimates considered by House	17,662,797,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	17,662,797,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	15,919,912,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the budget estimate, 1988	−1,742,885,000
Under the House-passed bill	−229,586,000

S183-4

CONTENTS

TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Page
Construction, general 25
Flood control and coastal emergencies 48
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries 48
General expenses 81
General investigations 6
General regulatory functions 81
Operation and maintenance, general 56

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:
Bureau of Reclamation:
Construction Program 88
Emergency fund 104
General administrative expenses 104
General investigations 82
Loan Program 101
Operation and maintenance 100

TITLE III

Department of Energy:
Atomic energy defense activities 168
Departmental administration 204
Energy supply, research and development activities 106
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 217
General science and research activities 160
Geothermal Resources Development Fund 219
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund 167
Power marketing administrations:
Alaska Power Administration 213
Bonneville Power Administration 213
Southeastern Power Administration 215
Southwestern Power Administration 215
Western Area Power Administration 216
Uranium supply and enrichment activities 153

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:
Appalachian Regional Commission 220
Delaware River Basin Commission 221
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin 221
Nuclear Regulatory Commission 222
Susquehanna River Basin Commission 222
Tennessee Valley Authority 223

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1988 beginning October 1, 1987 and ending September 30, 1988 for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy including atomic energy defense activities (except for fossil fuel programs, and certain conservation and regulatory programs) in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian Regional Development Programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 1988 budget estimates for this bill totals $17,662,797,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $15,919,912,000. This is a decrease of $1,742,885,000 below the budget estimates and $229,586,000 below the House bill.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $7,749,364,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$473,458,000
Research and development	993,401,000
Production and surveillance	2,258,460,000
Nuclear materials production	1,817,887,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	851,132,000
Nuclear directed energy weapons	309,000,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $2,056,207,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$105,102,000
Biological and environmental research	242,500,000
Nuclear fission	610,770,000
Magnetic fusion	345,600,000
Basic energy sciences	526,775,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $824,498,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$566,598,000
Nuclear physics	255,100,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $425,191,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs and activities include:

Appalachian regional development programs	$110,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	104,000,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	417,800,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	105,000,000

Water Resources Development

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,229,232,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the areas of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy supply. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability or control of water affects and benefits all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resources development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with one central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and for making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide for hydroelectric power generation and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for millions of urban and rural residents, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development.

A–76 Studies

The Committee is aware that OMB is conducting ongoing studies under Circular A–76 to determine the advisability of contracting out various programs governmentwide.

The Committee is not convinced, however, that the projected savings outweigh the cost of conducting the studies over the life of the contract. In addition, the Committee is concerned that adverse personnel impacts, which result from these studies, may not be warranted based on the projected savings.

Therefore, the Committee concurs with the House regarding funds for future studies and strongly urges OMB and the agencies involved to hold, to the extent possible, the personnel actions resulting from A–76 contracting changes to a minimum.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held 19 sessions of hearings in connection with the fiscal year 1988 appropriation bill. The Committee has received testimony from the executive branch, numerous Members of the House and Senate, several Governors, other State and local elected officials, and private citizens. The recommendations for 1987 have, therefore, been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present, on September 10, 1987, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on September 15, 1987, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1987	$136,287,000
Budget estimate, 1988	133,000,000
House allowance	148,712,000
Committee recommendation	141,450,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+8,450,000
House allowance	−7,262,000

An appropriation of $141,450,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is $7,262,000 below the House.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	ALABAMA								
(N)	MONTGOMERY TO GADSDEN, COOSA RIVER NAVIGATION, AL.....	1,253,000,000	20,867,400	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---
(FDP)	VALLEY CREEK, WARRIOR RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AL.....	650,000	398,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ALASKA								
(FC)	HOMER SPIT STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK.....	340,000	---	---	148,000	---	148,000	---	148,000
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR.....	900,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	50,000
(FDP)	RIVERS AND HARBORS, AK.....	9,752,000	4,828,000	1,064,000	---	1,064,000	---	1,064,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL ISLAND HARBOR, AK.....	850,000	535,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	---
	ARIZONA								
(RCP)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ.....	875,000	350,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	CLIFTON, AZ.....	1,100,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	500,000
(FC)	HOLBROOK, AZ.....	1,330,000	730,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, AZ.....	1,500,000	600,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NOGALES WASH, AZ.....	565,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	OLD CROSS CUT CANAL, AZ.....	630,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	100,000	---
(FC)	RILLITO, AZ.....	800,000	150,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
	ARKANSAS								
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, AR & OK.....	1,945,000	1,016,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(SPEC)	BEAVER LAKE, AR.....	400,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FC)	CANE CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT.....	100,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FC)	LITTLE RIVER, HORATIO.....	375,000	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	---
(FC)	NORTH LITTLE ROCK, AR (DARK HOLLOW).....	700,000	240,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, AR & LA.....	8,535,000	8,215,000	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---
(COM)	WHITE RIVER BASIN AUTHORIZATION REPORT, AR & MO.....	1,430,000	485,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	CALIFORNIA								
(N)	AVALON BAY HARBOR, CATALINA ISLAND	300,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(N)	BOLSA CHICA SUNSET HARBOR, CA	1,830,000	1,155,000	---	---	900,000	---	---	---
(FC)	CACHE CREEK, CA	3,000,000	1,444,000	---	280,000	---	280,000	---	380,000
(FC)	CALIENTE CREEK, CA	3,000,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	CALLEGUAS CREEK, CA	2,290,000	2,090,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, STORM AND TIDAL WAVES, CA	7,740,000	5,197,000	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FC)	COYOTE CREEK	375,000	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---
(FDP)	GOLETA STREAMS	2,650,000	1,265,000	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	2,000,000	775,000	---	625,000	---	625,000	---	625,000
(FDP)	IMPERIAL AND SAN DIEGO COUNTY STREAMS - SALTON SEA, CA	511,000	11,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	7,800,000	7,171,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW, CA	5,950,000	4,748,000	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE,CA. SAN RAFAEL CANAL	650,000	260,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	854,000	434,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NAPA RIVER BASIN	30,000,000	2,639,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
(N)	NEWPORT BAY (UPPER)	113,000	10,000	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED,	1,250,000	500,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, BLUE RIDGE, CA	500,000	200,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, CA	744,000	669,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO METRO AREA, CA	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER), CA	1,560,000	775,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (CHANNEL EXTENSION), CA	580,000	450,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	790,000	790,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	---
(N)	PORT SAN LUIS	280,000	---	---	---	280,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES	250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(N)	REDONDO BEACH (KING HARBOR), CA	730,000	694,000	36,000	---	36,000	---	---	136,000
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	2,900,000	2,433,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE, CA	4,280,000	3,438,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALAVERAS RIVER	450,000	---	---	---	450,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA	715,000	285,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	650,000	250,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
(FDP)	SAN LORENZO RIVER	300,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN AND ORANGE COUNTY, CA.....	9,500,000	8,249,000	650,000	---	650,000	---	650,000	---
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA.....	26,100,000	20,828,000	---	5,100,000	---	5,700,000	---	5,100,000
(RDP)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA.....	550,000	220,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER.....	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	VENTURA MARINA REVIEW, CA.....	685,000	475,000	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(FDP)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA.....	1,359,000	1,051,000	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
	COLORADO								
(FDP)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES - NORTH OF PUEBLO, CO..	730,000	320,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
	COMM N. MARIANAS								
(N)	NORTHERN MARIANA ISLAND HARBOR, CNMI.....	500,000	---	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
	CONNECTICUT								
(COM)	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN, AUTH REPORTS, CT, MA, NH & VT	4,799,000	2,972,000	274,000	---	274,000	---	274,000	---
(N)	NEW HAVEN HARBOR, CT.....	700,000	450,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(COM)	WEST CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT.....	625,000	250,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	DIST OF COLUMBIA								
(FC)	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY.....	2,300,000	657,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
	FLORIDA								
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL.....	267,000	110,000	157,000	---	157,000	---	157,000	---
(SP)	BROWARD COUNTY, FL.....	190,000	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL.....	162,000	50,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, HILLSBORO CANAL, FL.....	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	CLEARWATER SPOIL DISPOSAL, FL.....	240,000	60,000	---	---	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA EROSION AND STORM EFFECTS STUDY, FL..	7,780,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(RCP)	CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL, FL	75,000	---	75,000	---	---	---	75,000	---
(SP)	DAYTONA BEACH SHORES	50,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(SP)	FLAGLER COUNTY, FL	295,000	115,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(NO)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	296,000	196,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(NO)	HILLSBORO INLET, BROWARD COUNTY	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(BE)	INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, SEBASTIAN INLET & VERO BEACH								
(BE)	COMPONENTS	236,000	115,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(BE)	MANATEE COUNTY,FL SEC 201, AUTH 1975	522,000	222,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	100,000
(NO)	MEXICO BEACH INLET, FL	50,000	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
(NO)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL. (CLEANUP)	200,000	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000
(NO)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL,FL	170,000	---	---	---	---	170,000	---	---
(BE)	MONROE COUNTY, FL	225,000	125,000	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	NORTHWEST FLORIDA WATER SUPPLY, FL	350,000	50,000	---	---	300,000	---	200,000	---
(NO)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	165,000	93,000	72,000	---	72,000	---	72,000	---
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY BEACHES (VENICE/CASPERSON)	575,000	200,000	---	---	---	---	---	375,000
(BE)	ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL	350,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FDP)	ST. JOHNS RIVER, FL	1,319,000	100,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ST. MARYS RIVER BASIN, FL & GA	1,122,000	986,000	136,000	---	136,000	---	136,000	---
(RDP)	ST. PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	100,000	25,000	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ST. PETERSBURG (COASTAL AREAS)	250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SUWANNEE RIVER, FL	1,648,000	1,180,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(NO)	TAMPA BAY (PORT SUTTON), FL	250,000	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
(SP)	VIRGINIA KEY BARRIER ISLAND PARK	50,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(SP)	WATSON ISLAND PARK BEACH EROSION	50,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
	GEORGIA								
(NO)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	2,281,000	1,961,000	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---
(NO)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	1,389,000	950,000	439,000	---	439,000	---	439,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN MACON AREA, GA	300,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA, SC & NC	1,030,000	540,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	HAWAII								
(FC)	ALENAIO STREAM, HI	500,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	HARBORS AND RIVERS IN HAWAII, HI	3,485,000	3,425,000	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FDP)	HARBORS AND RIVERS IN HAWAII, KEOPU-HIENALOLI STREAM	315,000	130,000	102,000	---	102,000	---	102,000	---
(FDP)	HILO BAY METRO AREA, HI	1,580,000	1,503,000	77,000	---	77,000	---	77,000	---
	IDAHO								
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, MT, OR, & WA	22,240,000	18,940,000	1,327,000	---	1,327,000	---	1,327,000	---
(FDP)	MUD LAKE, ID	470,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FDP)	PALOUSE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WA	512,000	143,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY	8,601,000	6,078,600	971,000	---	971,000	---	971,000	---
	ILLINOIS								
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	803,000	691,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	CHICAGO - SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN, IL & IN	4,937,000	4,050,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
(FDP)	ILLINOIS RIVER BETWEEN HENRY AND NAPLES, IL	1,270,000	767,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(SP)	ILLINOIS SHORE EROSION, IL	1,608,000	1,003,000	143,000	---	550,000	---	143,000	---
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 52 AND 53, IL & KY	7,500,000	2,739,000	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---	2,500,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	1,400,000	801,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS (CUP)	318,520,000	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---
(FC)	O'HARE RESERVOIR (CUP), IL	800,000	60,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	WEST FRANKFORT AND VICINITY	250,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	200,000
	INDIANA								
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	1,050,000	932,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, PHASE I, IN	1,660,000	1,310,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(COM)	WABASH RIVER COMP STY, IN & IL - WABASH RIVER NAVIGATION	2,900,000	600,000	825,000	---	825,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	IOWA								
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND LEVEE & DRAINAGE DISTRICT, IA.....	400,000	100,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA.....	970,000	614,000	---	174,000	---	174,000	---	174,000
(FC)	THURMAN TO HAMBURG PUMPING FACILITIES.....	100,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES.....	400,000	75,000	---	---	---	---	---	325,000
	KANSAS								
(FDP)	UPPER LITTLE ARKANSAS RIVER.....	880,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	400,000
(FDP)	ARK RIVER AND TRIBS, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULSA, OK (REMA	7,290,000	5,819,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KS & MO.....	595,000	260,000	135,000	---	135,000	---	135,000	---
(FC)	DOUGLASS LAKE, KS.....	3,000,000	659,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER, KS & OK, ABOVE JOHN REDMOND DAM.	1,780,000	380,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO.....	670,000	310,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	KENTUCKY								
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY, GA, AL, MS, NC, TN...	8,358,000	4,816,000	1,470,000	---	1,470,000	---	1,470,000	---
(FC)	FISHTRAP RESERVOIR.....	50,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FC)	FRANKFORT, KY.; SOUTH FRANKFORT.....	682,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	200,000
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER & TRIBS, STATION CAMP CREEK, KY.....	800,000	400,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, KY.....	3,587,000	2,904,000	420,000	---	420,000	---	420,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM (HYDROPOWER), KY, IL, IN, OH, PA	15,370,000	11,734,000	2,031,000	---	2,031,000	---	2,031,000	---
	LOUISIANA								
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LA.....	2,149,000	1,437,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE - JUMP WATERWAY, LA.....	179,000	77,000	52,000	---	52,000	---	52,000	---
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION.....	4,270,000	3,401,000	425,000	---	425,000	---	425,000	---
(FDP)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN - WEST SHORE, LA.....	740,000	230,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LA - HURRICANE PROTECTION.....	1,200,000	500,000	275,000	---	275,000	---	275,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - LAND LOSS AND MARSH								

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FDP)	CREATION	1,546,000	903,000	276,000	---	276,000	---	276,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LA-SHORE & BARRIER ISLAND EROSION	1,716,000	896,000	165,000	---	165,000	---	165,000	---
(FDP)	MERMENTAU, VERMILION AND CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU TECH	5,058,000	2,850,000	510,000	---	510,000	---	510,000	---
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET - BANK EROSION, LA	472,000	171,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, SHREVEPORT,LA TO VICINITY INDEX,AR	1,700,000	1,378,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FDP)	UPPER BAYOU TECHE, LA	386,000	220,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	WEST BANK OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS	1,725,000	739,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	W. BANK HURRICANE PROTETION WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL	1,900,000	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	MAINE								
(FDP)	PENOBSCOT, KENNEBEC, AND SACO RIVER BASINS, MA & N.H.	950,000	---	---	---	---	---	950,000	---
	MARYLAND								
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MD AND ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, VA	2,600,000	791,000	---	500,000	---	800,000	---	500,000
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY (SHORELINE EROSION) MD & VA	2,060,000	500,000	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, MD, PA & WV	8,733,000	6,861,000	850,000	---	850,000	---	850,000	---
	MARSHALL ISLANDS								
(SP)	COASTAL RESOURCE ATLAS & INVENTORY REPORTS	250,000	---	---	---	---	---	250,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(FC)	BROCKTON	875,000	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(FC)	MASSACHUSETTS COASTAL, ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA	1,200,000	788,000	---	117,000	---	117,000	---	117,000
(N)	MERRIMACK RIVER BTWN LOWELL & LAWRENCE	500,000	---	---	---	---	80,000	---	---
(N)	NEPONSET RIVER	225,000	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(BE)	NORTH BEACH IN CHATHAM	300,000	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(COM)	SOUTHEASTERN NEW ENGLAND AUTH. REPORTS, MA, RI & CT	3,750,000	2,847,000	540,000	---	540,000	---	540,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	MICHIGAN								
(N)	INLAND ROUTE, MI	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(BE)	LAKE SUPERIOR SHORELINE EROSION	1,500,000	---	---	---	1,500,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	3,800,000	2,136,000	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH RIVER BASIN, MI	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---
	MINNESOTA								
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	725,000	180,000	---	245,000	---	245,000	---	245,000
(N)	GREAT LAKES MARKETING BOARD	1,000,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY, MN	6,750,000	5,309,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT ST. PAUL	1,100,000	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	---
(FDP)	RAINEY RIVER BASIN	1,600,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FC)	ROOT RIVER AT HOUSTON, MN	1,000,000	250,000	---	247,000	---	247,000	---	247,000
(FDP)	WILD RICE, MARSH RIVERS, MN	900,000	400,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI								
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,500,000	1,169,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FDP)	LOWER PEARL BASIN FLOW DISTRIBUTION, MS & LA	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI GULF COASTAL AREAS,MS	685,000	412,000	121,000	---	121,000	---	121,000	---
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,160,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER BASIN, MS & LA	8,720,000	8,408,000	230,000	---	230,000	---	230,000	---
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SHOCCOE DAM, MS	3,300,000	1,318,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FDP)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	3,500,000	1,863,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR	1,400,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	250,000
	MISSOURI								
(FC)	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY, MO	1,400,000	750,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON METRO AREA, MO	2,500,000	500,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FDP)	CREVE COEUR CREEK, MO	1,088,000	478,000	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
(FDP)	CUIVRE RIVER AREA, MO	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(FDP)	GRAND RIVER BASIN, MO & IA	760,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---
(FC)	MALINE CREEK, MO	4,000,000	1,056,000	---	885,000	---	885,000	---	885,000
(FDP)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, MO	1,021,000	696,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FDP)	OSAGE RIVER BASIN, MO, ABOVE HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM	1,370,000	1,019,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(FC)	STE. GENEVIEVE, MISSOURI	3,100,000	---	---	---	---	450,000	---	---
(FDP)	ST. JOSEPH, MO AND VICINITY	510,000	210,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN AREA, MO & IL	11,575,000	11,141,000	434,000	---	434,000	---	434,000	---
	MONTANA								
(SPE)	MILK RIVER, BASIN, MT	120,000	---	---	---	---	---	120,000	---
	NEBRASKA								
(FDP)	ANTELOP CREEK	125,000	---	---	---	---	---	125,000	---
(SPEC)	ELM CREEK, DECATUR	100,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(SPEC)	PLATTE RIVER BANK STABILIZATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.	500,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	PLATTE RIVER BASIN, CO, NE & WY	450,000	200,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
	NEVADA								
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH AND TRIBUTARIES, NV	1,670,000	1,259,000	253,000	---	253,000	---	253,000	---
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	4,300,000	---	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,340,000
(FC)	HEMENWAY VALLEY	60,000	---	---	---	---	---	60,000	---
	NEW HAMPSHIRE								
(FDP)	ASHUELOT RIVER, NH	215,000	---	215,000	---	215,000	---	215,000	---
(FDP)	MASCOMA RIVER, NH	215,000	---	215,000	---	215,000	---	215,000	---
	NEW JERSEY								
(FDP)	BEATTIES DAM	800,000	---	---	---	800,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA & DE	6,334,000	5,113,000	780,000	---	780,000	---	780,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER VICINITY OF CAMDEN, NJ (BECKETT ST.)	250,000	---	---	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000
(SP)	EAST BANK STABILIZATION	200,000	---	---	---	800,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ELIZABETH RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	645,000	195,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GREENWOOD LAKE	350,000	---	---	---	1,300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	HACKENSACK RIVER BASIN, NJ & NY	1,606,000	1,306,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ	3,900,000	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK,NJ	1,900,000	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
(N)	NEW JERSEY INW, NJ	670,000	195,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN LAND ACQUISITION	400,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN STUDY, NJ & NY (PHASE 1)	21,000,000	19,848,000	1,152,000	---	1,152,000	---	1,152,000	---
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM	55,000,000	---	---	---	---	1,500,000	---	---
(FDP)	PINE BROOK, MANALAPAN	150,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	POPLAR BROOK	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	1,300,000	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS AT MAHWAH, NJ & SUFFERN, NY	700,000	470,000	---	230,000	---	230,000	---	230,000
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	5,300,000	1,796,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000
	NEW MEXICO								
(FC)	MID RIO GRANDE BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NM	2,360,000	1,891,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	PECOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES - ROSWELL, NM	825,000	200,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	PECOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES - CARLSBAD, NM	500,000	200,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM & CO	7,270,000	6,349,000	525,000	---	525,000	---	525,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE	1,360,000	500,000	---	390,000	---	370,000	---	390,000
	NEW YORK								
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL EXT. - TO FRESH KILLS, STATEN ISL.	625,000	250,000	200,000	---	---	1,600,000	200,000	---
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL-HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL	1,100,000	777,000	---	323,000	---	323,000	---	323,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR	900,000	---	---	---	---	900,000	---	---
(FDP)	BUFFALO METRO AREA, NY	2,820,000	2,143,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FDP)	CATTARAUGUS CREEK, NY	520,000	451,000	114,000	---	114,000	---	114,000	---
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR	200,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	200,000
(COM)	GENESEE RIVER BASIN AUTH REPORT, NY	890,000	726,000	164,000	---	164,000	---	164,000	---
(N)	GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, NY	500,000	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	HEMPSTEAD HARBOR	190,000	125,000	---	---	---	---	---	65,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CH. FROM NYC TO ALBANY, NY	500,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	LONG BEACH	400,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MOOSE AND BLACK RIVERS, NY	900,000	340,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
(N)	NY HARBOR & ADJACENT CH., PORT JERSEY, NJ & NY	1,350,000	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---
(N)	OLCOTT HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, NY	1,100,000	250,000	---	---	350,000	---	---	---
(BE)	ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT	1,800,000	---	---	---	---	450,000	---	1,000,000
(FC)	SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD AND GREENBURGH, NY	950,000	831,000	---	119,000	---	119,000	---	119,000
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	1,000,000	946,000	---	54,000	---	54,000	---	54,000
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CO. STREAMS - MAMARONECK & SHELDRAKE RIVER	3,000,000	2,510,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CO. STREAMS - TOWN OF MAMARONECK	580,000	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	---
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(BE)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY	31,700,000	302,100	---	---	---	300,000	---	---
(FDP)	EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA ABOVE CAPE LOOKOUT, NC	1,602,000	739,000	390,000	---	390,000	---	390,000	---
(FDP)	HAMLET CITY LAKE	50,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	523,000	316,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER, NC	2,993,000	2,087,000	735,000	---	735,000	---	735,000	---
(SP)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET	812,000	702,000	---	---	---	---	110,000	---
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	670,000	287,000	---	195,000	---	195,000	---	195,000
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, ND	4,550,000	4,111,000	---	439,000	---	439,000	---	439,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	OHIO								
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY, OH	3,885,000	3,710,000	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY, GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS INTERIM, OH	416,000	191,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	FAIRFIELD, OH	1,209,000	959,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(ND)	LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER CANAL, OH & PA	2,000,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	---
(FC)	HOLES CREEK AT WEST CARROLLTON AND MORAINE, OH	770,000	394,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000
(FC)	LOGAN, OH	1,000,000	726,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(ND)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	430,000	200,000	---	124,000	---	124,000	---	124,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, OH	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	NELSONVILLE, OH	1,085,000	761,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(FC)	NORTH CHILLICOTHE, OH	1,150,000	250,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(SPE)	OHIO RIVER BETWEEN RIVERMILE 40-491 (WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT)	900,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SANDUSKY RIVER, OH	1,020,000	125,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILION RIVER, OH	504,000	207,000	142,000	---	142,000	---	142,000	---
(FDP)	WHEELING CREEK WATERSHED	125,000	---	---	---	125,000	---	---	---
	OKLAHOMA								
(COM)	ARK RIV & TRIBS, SCISE AREAS OF OK-COMPREHENSIVE STUDY	2,000,000	1,581,000	419,000	---	419,000	---	419,000	---
(FC)	DENISON DAM (LAKE TEXOMA) TX & OK (RESTUDY)	1,467,000	967,000	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FC)	FRY CREEK LOCAL PROTECTION, BIXBY, OK	590,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	330,000
(SPE)	LUKFATA LAKE, OKLAHOMA	830,000	417,000	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	NORTH CANADIAN RIVER ABOVE LAKE OVERHOLSER, OK	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---	210,000	---
(COM)	RED RIVER BASIN, OK, AR, LA & TX (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY)	3,100,000	2,440,000	660,000	---	660,000	---	660,000	---
	OREGON								
(ND)	COOS BAY, OR (DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION)	488,000	250,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	UMPQUA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, OR	2,315,000	1,374,000	374,000	---	374,000	---	374,000	---
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OR	3,872,600	2,437,000	745,000	---	745,000	---	745,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	PENNSYLVANIA								
(SPEC)	CHESAPEAKE BAY - SESQUEHANNA RIVER FLOW REALLOCATION, PA & MD	900,000	600,000	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LACKAWANNA RIVER BASIN COMP, PA	800,000	300,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN, PA	3,675,000	2,626,000	---	1,049,000	---	1,049,000	---	1,049,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA (MOD)	3,900,000	1,653,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER (MOUTH TO PENROSE AVENUE), PA	310,000	50,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA BASIN AT HARRISBURG, PA	4,500,000	2,613,000	---	965,000	---	965,000	---	965,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY LEVEE RAISING, PA	7,700,000	2,282,000	---	1,800,000	---	1,800,000	---	1,800,000
	PUERTO RICO								
(FDP)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	377,000	172,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GUANAJIBO RIVER, PR	894,000	594,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	GUAYANILLA RIVER BASIN	100,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	6,000,000	800,000	---	1,500,000	---	4,020,000	---	1,500,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	2,000,000	---	---	520,000	---	---	---	520,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(BE)	FOLLY BEACH SC	240,000	---	---	---	---	180,000	---	180,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
(SPE)	JAMES RIVER FLOOD CONTROL	350,000	---	---	---	---	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	VERMILLION RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	200,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	330,000	110,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
	TENNESSEE								
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE, TN	4,722,000	4,379,000	235,000	---	235,000	---	235,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	TEXAS								
(FDP)	BEALS CREEK, TEX. RECONN	75,000	---	---	---	---	---	75,000	---
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX (42-FOOT PROJECT)	1,200,000	300,000	---	330,000	---	330,000	---	330,000
(N)	BRAZOS RIVER DIVERSION CHANNEL, TX	380,000	---	---	---	380,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	BRAZOS RIVER & TRIBS. (FT. BEND & BRAZORIA COUNTIES)	350,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	BRAZOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX & NM	8,070,000	6,214,000	642,000	---	642,000	---	642,000	---
(FDP)	CAMERON COUNTY, TX	1,736,000	290,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(RCP)	DALLAS FLOODWAY, TX (SEC. 216 - REVEIW OF COMP. PROJ.)	325,000	---	---	---	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	HILLEBRANDT BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	623,000	328,000	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---
(SPEC)	LAKE WORTH (SILT REMOVAL)	400,000	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
(FDP)	LITTLE FOSSIL CREEK, VICINITY OF HALTOM CITY, TX	513,000	225,000	75,000	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE BASIN, CO, NM & TX - REEVALUATION OF OPERATING PLAN	500,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU AT HOUSTON, TX	2,200,000	1,128,000	---	850,000	---	850,000	---	850,000
(N)	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX (50-FOOT PROJECT)	1,800,000	1,087,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(NP)	CHANNEL TO LIBERTY, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX	3,600,000	2,111,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---
(FC)	UPPER WHITE OAK BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, VICINITY OF HOU	3,900,000	2,607,000	---	1,050,000	---	1,050,000	---	1,050,000
	UTAH								
(FDP)	BEAR RIVER BASIN, UT, ID & WY	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	GREAT SALT LAKE, UTAH	1,250,000	500,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN, UT	2,750,000	2,520,000	230,000	---	230,000	---	230,000	---
	VIRGINIA								
(FDP)	COVINGTON, VIRGINIA	475,000	225,000	124,000	---	124,000	---	124,000	---
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, VA, HEADWATERS AREA	1,410,000	665,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	395,000
(FDP)	UPPER JAMES RIVER BASIN , VIRGINIA	600,000	200,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	2,860,000	1,700,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	WASHINGTON								
(IO)	BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	365,000	150,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
(IO)	BLAIR AND SITCUM WATERWAYS, WA	2,640,000	1,313,000	---	---	---	700,000	---	---
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA	1,700,000	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(IO)	GRAYS HARBOR CHEHALIS AND HOQUIAM RIVERS, WA	5,860,000	3,657,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000
(IO)	LA CONNER, WA	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(IO)	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	365,000	150,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
(COM)	PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS, WA	8,427,000	6,820,000	395,000	---	395,000	---	395,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(FDP)	CABIN CREEK	435,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(COM)	KANAWHA RIVER BASIN (AUTHORIZATION REPORTS), WV, VA	5,919,000	4,466,000	905,000	---	905,000	---	905,000	---
(IO)	KANAWHA RIVER, WV	5,395,000	3,945,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	MIDDLE ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN DODDRIDGE & TYLER CNTYS	402,000	152,000	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MOOREFIELD, WEST VIRGINIA	375,000	145,000	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	PETERSBURG, WEST VIRGINIA	523,000	246,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER, WEST VIRGINIA	600,000	160,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
	WISCONSIN								
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER/BLACK RIVER/LA CROSSE RIVER	240,000	---	---	---	240,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	WISCONSIN RIVER AT PORTAGE	4,860,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS								
	REVIEW FOR DEAUTHORIZATION	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	---	---	8,150,000	---	8,800,000	---	8,150,000	---
	NATIONWIDE STUDIES								
	SECTION 719 PROJECT EVALUATION & SELECTION CRITERIA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget investigations	Estimates planning	House investigations	Allowance planning	Senate investigations	Allowance planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA								
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	---	---	535,000	---	535,000	---	535,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	---	---	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	---	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	---	---	9,200,000	---	9,200,000	---	9,200,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	---	---	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	---	---	130,000	---	130,000	---	130,000	---
	COASTAL DATA COLLECTION	---	---	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---	2,200,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	---	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	---	---	235,000	---	235,000	---	235,000	---
	TOTAL			73,266,000	38,234,000	92,098,000	54,289,000	77,695,000	44,830,000
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	---	21,500,000	---	19,700,000	---	21,500,000	---
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			94,766,000	38,234,000	111,798,000	54,289,000	99,195,000	44,830,000
	APPLICATION OF PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED FUNDS	---	---	---	---	-17,375,000	---	-2,575,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			133,000,000		148,712,000		141,450,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC) SPECIAL
(COMP) COMPREHENSIVE
(RDP) RESTUDY OF DEFERRED PROJECT
(RCP) REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT

(PHASE I) AUTHORIZED FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

Clifton, AZ.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Corps to begin preconstruction engineering and design on the Clifton, AZ, flood damage prevention project. Given the need for the improvements to reduce flood damages at Clifton, the Committee directs the Corps to expedite, where possible, preconstruction activities related to this project.

Milk River basin, MT.—The Committee has provided $120,000 for the Corps of Engineers to review the reports on the Milk River, MT, to determine the advisability of water and related resources and improvements for flood control, bank stabilization, and other purposes within the Milk River basin.

Santa Ana River, CA.—The Committee wishes to restate its instructions that planning and engineering on all elements of the project proceed concurrently.

In addition, the Committee is aware of the potential of additional project benefits that could possibly be realized if water supply and conservation storage are feasible. The Corps is urged to maximize the level of water conservation and supply consistent with the provisions contained in Public Law 99–662 for the Santa Ana mainstem and Prado Dam projects.

Vermillion River basin, SD.—An amount of $200,000 has been provided to initiate and complete the reconnaissance study of the water resource needs in the Vermillion River basin in South Dakota.

Roanoke River, upper basin, VA.—In action on the 1987 Energy and Water appropriations bill, the Committee provided $480,000 and direction for the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Engineers to continue planning and engineering on the Roanoke River, upper basin, VA, project. The Committee action recognized that the Chief of Engineer's report dated August 5, 1985, included providing floodproofing for Roanoke Memorial Hospital and the city sewage treatment plant. In addition, Public Law 99–662, the recently enacted Water Resources Development Act of 1986, authorized this project in accordance with the Chief's report of August 5, 1985.

The Committee has been informed that the Secretary of the Army is not proceeding with the planning and design of this project as envisioned by the Committee on Appropriations and in accordance with the congressional authorization. The Committee, therefore, has included $395,000, the full capability of the Corps, and language in the bill directing the Secretary of the Army to include floodproofing for Roanoke Memorial Hospital and the city sewage treatment as authorized.

Newport Bay Harbor, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $250,000 for the Corps to undertake a plan of review for Newport Bay Harbor, CA, as required by Public Law 99–662. It should be pointed out that the construction of this project is contingent upon a favorable report being issued and approved by the Secretary of the Army as provided by section 903(b).

Vicksburg Harbor, MS.—The Committee has included $250,000 in the bill for the Corps to complete a reevaluation report on the Vicksburg Harbor project prior to preceeding with engineering and design.

Hempstead Harbor, NY.—The Committee has been informed that the Corps has recently resumed engineering and design on the Hempstead Harbor project in New York and that additional funding is required in 1988 to complete those activities. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes $65,000 to complete plans and specifications for the project in fiscal 1988.

Redondo Beach, CA.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Corps to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Redondo Beach, CA, breakwater project as authorized by Public Law 99–662 subject to a favorable feasibility study report.

Northern Mariana Island Harbor, CNMI.—The Committee wishes to point out the strategic importance and location of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and how critical having adequate harbor facilities is to supporting economy of the Commonwealth. Accordingly, the Committee urges the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers to accelerate, to the extent possible, the preconstruction engineering and design of the Siapan Harbor project so that construction can be initiated at the earliest possible date.

Penobscot, Kennebec, and Saco River and Tributaries, ME.—The Committee recommendation includes $950,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study related to the Saco River, Kennebec River, and the Penobscot River and their tributaries in Maine and New Hampshire to determine the advisability of providing improvements in the interest of flood control and allied purposes.

Crisfield Harbor, MD.--The Committee is concerned with the lack of effort by the Corps of Engineers to coordinate and work with local officials in Somerset County, MD, in determining the level of commerce needed to justify deepening of Crisfield Harbor. The Committee directs the Corps to assist local officials in determining the level of commerce that would be needed to justify the channel deepening. Finally, the Committee expects the Corps to keep congressional and local officials informed on the status of their efforts in this regard.

Atlantic Coast of Maryland and Assateague Island, VA.—The Committee recognizes the cooperative relationship between the Corps of Engineers and the State of Maryland regarding the design and construction of a combined recreational beach and hurricane protection project for the Atlantic coast of Maryland. Under a unique two phase approach to the project, the Committee is aware that the State of Maryland will be responsible for the construction of a beach nourishment segment providing improved recreational benefits along the Maryland coast, while the Corps of Engineers will design and construct a hurricane protection project along the same coastline. Due to the high degree of cooperation between the State of Maryland and the Corps, the timely completion of this total project is expected to realize significant cost savings to the Federal Government. To insure that the Corps of Engineers' project design schedule fully complements the State of Maryland's phase I construction schedule, thereby permitting both parties to realize maximum cost savings, the Committee directs the Corps to ex-

peditiously adjust its design and specifications schedule to permit construction of the Federal hurricane protection project to commence as soon as possible after completion of phase I by the State of Maryland. The Committee expects the Corps to seek construction funding to comply fully with this construction schedule and to adjust the 1988 funding for the engineering and design of the Federal portion in order to complement and expedite the project schedule.

Republic of the Marshall Islands, coastal resource management plans.—The Committee has included $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete, under authority of section 226 of Public Law 99–239, Coastal Resource Atlas and inventory reports for the highest priority islands within the Republic of the Marshall Islands group.

West Frankfort and vicinity, IL.—The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for the Corps to conduct a reconnaissance level study of the flooding problems in and around west Frankfort and vicinity in Illinois, including Middle Fork Creek, Pond Creek, and Big Muddy Basin.

Coordination with other agencies.—The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to work with the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin on issues of mutual interest such as flood control, water supply and quality, navigation, and recreation.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1987	$1,152,150,000
Budget estimate, 1988	1,188,000,000
House allowance	1,150,142,000
Committee recommendation	1,166,136,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−21,864,000
House allowance	+15,994,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,166,136,000. This is $21,864,000 under the budget request for 1988.

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	ALABAMA					
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSON, AL	1,985,000	180,000	1,350,000	100,000	100,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	284,040,000	6,166,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000
(FC)	THREEMILE CREEK, AL	9,800,000	2,112,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, AL	26,135,000	1,928,000	8,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM, AL	122,000,000	20,362,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
	ALASKA					
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	210,000,000	205,883,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	SNETTISHAM, AK	132,000,000	112,658,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
(N)	ST. PAUL ISLAND HARBOR	11,800,000	535,000	---	---	3,000,000
	AMERICAN SAMOA					
(BE)	COCONUT POINT, NU'UULI, TUTUILA ISL	2,030,000	---	---	50,000	---
(BE)	TUTUILA ISL, CANNERIES TO BREAKERS PT	1,200,000	---	---	150,000	---
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	PHOENIX ARIZONA AND VICINITY, AZ (STAGE 2)	226,000,000	86,496,000	38,000,000	22,500,000	22,500,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA WASH (TAT MOMOLIKOT DAM), AZ	17,219,000	10,219,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	ARKANSAS					
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR	11,050,000	1,866,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK	547,500,000	542,071,000	4,350,000	4,850,000	4,350,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	269,000,000	224,444,000	4,300,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT (SEC. 107)	2,000,000	---	---	---	1,000,000
	CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	CACHE CREEK SETTLING BASIN	15,180,000	---	---	250,000	---
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	12,700,000	10,296,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE, CA	346,000,000	304,020,000	8,200,000	9,100,000	8,200,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS, CA	10,500,000	2,637,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	17,976,000	16,974,000	1,002,000	1,002,000	1,002,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	62,000,000	6,200,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	385,000,000	353,481,000	4,100,000	4,600,000	4,100,000
(N)	OAKLAND INNER HARBOR	19,280,000	782,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	1,200,000
(N)	OAKLAND OUTER HARBOR, CA	14,920,000	682,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER, CA	2,945,000	580,000	1,865,000	1,865,000	1,865,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEK, CA	49,200,000	1,525,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	20,200,000	1,329,000	900,000	900,000	700,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA (DEF CORR)	74,600,000	69,715,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	92,300,000	61,534,000	9,500,000	10,500,000	9,500,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	39,500,000	1,105,000	11,000,000	6,400,000	6,400,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES, CA..	11,900,000	11,764,000	98,000	98,000	98,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA.....	132,000,000	51,204,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA.....	33,900,000	2,274,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER, CA.....	25,200,000	20,286,000	4,913,000	4,913,000	4,913,000
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK, CA.....	63,700,000	51,147,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
(FC)	WHITEWATER RIVER FLOODWARNING SYSTEM.....	300,000	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA.....	19,200,000	4,733,000	5,360,000	5,360,000	5,360,000
	COLORADO					
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO.....	95,000,000	94,032,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AT PUEBLO, CO.....	6,270,000	340,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	WESTERLY CREEK, CO.....	8,830,000	490,000	700,000	700,000	550,000
	FLORIDA					
(BE)	BROWARD COUNTY, FL (REIMB).....	22,300,000	14,877,000	556,000	556,000	556,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL.....	772,000,000	304,165,400	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
(N)	CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL (LAND ACQUISITION).....	32,000,000	---	---	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL.....	47,400,000	36,643,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, NORTH OF HAULOVER BEACH PARK, FL.....	13,000,000	5,916,000	2,534,000	2,534,000	2,534,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY, FL.....	19,700,000	11,457,000	5,000,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL.....	153,000,000	70,140,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	INDIAN RIVER CTY - VERO BEACH COMPONENT.....	5,440,000	---	---	2,000,000	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, MILL COVE, FL	3,950,000	982,000	2,968,000	2,968,000	2,968,000
(SP)	KISSIMMEE RIVER DEMONSTRATION	3,000,000	---	---	---	3,000,000
(SP)	MIAMI RIVER PARK	---	---	---	---	2,500,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	9,450,000	---	2,400,000	2,400,000	550,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	18,700,000	6,498,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	GEORGIA					
(FC)	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA	7,941,000	249,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	545,000,000	435,800,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	7,560,000	3,486,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	1,500,000
	GUAM					
(FC)	AGANA RIVER, GU	4,090,000	250,000	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	HAWAII					
(FC)	KAHOMA STREAM, MAUI, HI	10,840,000	6,656,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
	ILLINOIS					
(N)	BRANDON ROAD LOCK AND DAM, ILLINOIS RIVER, IL (REHAB)	23,500,000	21,586,000	1,914,000	1,914,000	1,914,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS & VIC,IL	22,500,000	16,847,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	GALLATIN CNTY, STREAMBANK EROSION, AREA 1 - OHIO RIV	1,000,000	---	---	1,000,000	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL.....	14,100,000	10,658,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 26, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALTON, IL & MO....	744,000,000	497,248,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 26, SECOND LOCK, IL & MO.....	214,000,000	8,536,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	MAUVAISE TERRE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL.....	1,499,000	600,000	419,000	419,000	419,000
(FC)	MUCK LEVEE,IL.....	12,000	---	---	12,000	---
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL.....	16,700,000	610,000	2,000,000	5,950,000	700,000
(FC)	ROCKFORD, IL.....	10,170,000	9,626,000	544,000	544,000	544,000
(N)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, IL, IN & KY.....	274,100,000	273,275,000	342,000	342,000	342,000
(FC)	SOUTH QUINCY LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, IL.....	7,590,000	559,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENVIR MANGMENT PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN, & WI.....	196,000,000	2,054,000	4,168,000	4,168,000	6,700,000
	INDIANA					
(FC)	EVANSVILLE, IN.....	49,000,000	32,220,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
	IOWA					
(FC)	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER AND GREENBELT (DRAG), IA..	4,480,000	589,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	LAKE RED ROCK.....	30,000,000	500,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO.....	254,700,000	90,597,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE,IA 1958 ACT.....	128,410,000	114,263,000	---	2,200,000	1,500,000
(FC)	WATERLOO.....	2,250,000	---	---	500,000	---

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	KANSAS					
(FC)	GREAT BEND, KS	21,000,000	1,193,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	HALSTEAD, KS	5,600,000	785,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	KENTUCKY					
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA, KY & TN	129,822,000	99,944,000	3,583,000	3,583,000	3,583,000
(FC)	CAMPGROUND LAKE	1,400,000	382,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	63,407,000	57,867,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	SALYERSVILLE	2,400,000	221,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	57,700,000	48,582,000	6,500,000	7,500,000	6,500,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	92,225,000	81,776,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	97,385,000	61,487,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
	LOUISIANA					
(BE)	FT. LIVINGSTON GRAND TERRE ISLAND	691,000	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	13,489,000	10,304,000	822,000	822,000	822,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	510,000,000	196,971,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	64,000,000	45,551,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	328,000,000	53,441,000	23,000,000	33,500,000	28,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	492,000,000	89,067,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE	170,000,000	3,007,000	8,300,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	167,000,000	58,043,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES (BAUCOMVILLE AREA)	5,240,000	---	---	120,000	120,000
(FC)	PEARL RIVER, SLIDELL, ST. TAMMANY PARISH, LA	17,400,000	1,173,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, LA, AR 1968, 1976 ACTS	69,440,000	69,440,000	---	5,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	1,564,000,000	779,363,000	87,000,000	87,000,000	103,690,000
(FC)	TECHE-VERMILLION BASIN (REIMBURSEMENT)	700,000	---	---	---	700,000
	MAINE					
(N)	JONESPORT HARBOR, ME	8,910,000	560,000	4,340,000	2,340,000	2,340,000
(FC)	ST. JOHN RIVER BASIN	3,430,000	---	---	500,000	---
	MARYLAND					
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD & VA (50 FT					
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD & VA (50-FT DEEP)	179,000,000	26,967,000	47,000,000	34,900,000	34,900,000
	MASSACHUSETTS					
(BE)	REVERE BEACH, MA	6,525,000	342,000	2,450,000	1,850,000	1,850,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	22,275,000	400,000	6,800,000	5,500,000	5,500,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK, MN	25,100,000	7,787,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(FC)	CHASKA, MN	21,400,000	1,843,000	---	1,400,000	---
(FC)	GENTILLY	400,000	---	--	360,000	---
(FC)	MANKATO AND NORTH MANKATO, MN	95,100,000	84,046,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
(FC)	SOUTH FORK ZUMBRO RIVER AT ROCHESTER, MN	50,700,000	3,424,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(BE)	SKY HARBOR AIRPORT EROSION CONTROL, DULUTH	250,000	---	---	250,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI					
(FC)	SOWASHEE CREEK, MS	13,440,000	1,006,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	49,000,000	21,633,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, MO	162,000,000	23,100,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(FC)	HANNIBAL	4,840,000	---	---	200,000	---
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	550,000,000	527,335,000	6,200,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	138,900,000	134,331,000	2,600,000	2,150,000	2,150,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	182,000,000	115,025,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.....	21,000,000	907,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE.....	52,800,000	45,518,000	2,500,000	3,500,000	2,500,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE					
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME.....	14,175,000	1,145,000	7,500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
	NEW JERSEY					
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	26,625,000	4,760,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ.....	18,400,000	150,000	---	4,500,000	4,500,000
(FC)	LIBERTY STATE PARK LEVEE AND SEAWALL, NJ.....	19,100,000	5,030,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET.....	145,900,000	5,035,000	---	2,300,000	1,200,000
	NEW MEXICO					
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM.....	40,000,000	200,000	---	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM.....	20,400,000	871,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	660,000
(FC)	ALBUQUERQUE NORTH DIVERSION CHANNELS, NM (DEF CORR)...	690,000	336,000	354,000	354,000	354,000
(FC)	PUERCO RIVER AT GALLUP, NM.....	5,500,000	25,000	760,000	760,000	460,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT, NM...	12,000,000	1,314,000	700,000	700,000	300,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	NEW YORK					
(FC)	ARDSLEY, NY	3,310,000	850,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET - ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY	25,400,000	21,345,000	4,055,000	4,055,000	4,055,000
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK, NY	12,800,000	5,186,000	4,240,000	4,240,000	4,240,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	198,000,000	12,255,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000
(N)	MORICHES INLET, NY	7,215,000	3,606,000	3,609,000	3,609,000	3,609,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY/NJ	46,300,000	22,991,000	4,880,000	4,880,000	4,880,000
(N)	PORT ONTARIO, NY	2,070,000	1,570,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(N)	AIWW-REPL FED HWY BRIDGES,NC 1970,76 ACTS	54,500,000	22,666,000	---	230,000	---
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	135,820,000	121,627,000	10,600,000	10,600,000	10,600,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	16,252,000	7,899,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	164,000,000	139,800,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
	NORTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	LAKE DARLING, SOURIS RIVER, ND	78,200,000	6,487,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	20,500,000
	OHIO					
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR	36,000,000	---	---	11,000,000	300,000
(N)	GENEVA-ON-THE-LAKE, OH	4,068,000	2,533,000	1,487,000	1,487,000	1,487,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(N)	MAUMEE BAY	11,850,000	---	---	1,180,000	---
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	149,000,000	53,348,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
(FC)	MOHAWK DAM, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY)	4,940,000	2,560,000	1,800,000	3,800,000	1,800,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (REHAB)	25,300,000	21,876,000	2,300,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	NEWARK, OH	9,900,000	6,073,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(FC)	REMO BEACH HOWARD FARMS, OH	5,560,000	625,000	1,180,000	1,180,000	250,000
(FC)	WALNUT & CHERRY ST. BRIDGES, MASSILLON	1,100,000	---	---	1,100,000	---
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	84,400,000	78,362,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OKLAHOMA (BRIDGE REPLACEMENT)	2,000,000	1,520,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, OK	80,900,000	1,284,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(FC)	PARKER LAKE, OKLAHOMA, MUDDY BOGGY CREEK	46,000,000	1,535,000	---	7,000,000	---
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE	113,300,000	103,595,000	---	---	2,000,000
	OREGON					
(N)	THE DALLES	---	---	---	---	510,000
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA	200,000,000	20,580,000	40,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA	665,000,000	649,499,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	120,000,000	63,193,000	35,000,000	39,000,000	35,000,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	24,400,000	22,016,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR	28,900,000	25,750,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	PENNSYLVANIA					
(FC)	CONNEMAUGH LAKE, PA (MODIFICATION)	2,520,000	2,382,000	138,000	138,000	138,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA (MODIFICATION)	11,700,000	7,129,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	1,000,000
(N)	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONOGAHELA RIVER, PA	123,000,000	3,174,000	3,300,000	6,800,000	5,300,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, PA (REHAB)	33,200,000	24,282,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
(N)	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA/WV	82,900,000	701,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (NOURISHMENT)	16,301,000	13,684,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA (PERMANENT REPAIR)	18,900,000	---	---	---	2,500,000
(FC)	TAMAQUA, PA	8,700,000	1,900,000	3,000,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA	17,076,000	303,000	1,000,000	200,000	200,000
	PUERTO RICO					
(N)	PONCE HARBOR, PR	7,220,000	1,017,000	6,203,000	6,203,000	6,203,000
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	318,000,000	167,502,000	28,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	64,875,000	497,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	2,200,000
(MP)	COOPER RIVER SEISMIC MODIFICATION	28,000,000	10,500,000	---	---	13,500,000
	TEXAS					
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBS-ADDICKS & BARKER DAMS (DAM SAFETY), TX	9,500,000	5,071,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000

1988 NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS

The President's budget for 1988 included $28,440,000 to initiate construction on 13 new water resource development projects with a total Federal cost of $307,386,000. The bill as passed by the House provided $59,990,000 for 43 new starts costing $540,269,000. The Committee recommendation to the Senate includes $25,570,000 for 22 new construction projects including 2 projects under Mississippi River and tributaries with a total Federal cost of $409,676,000.

With passage of the Water Resources Development Act, Public Law 99–662, last year, the Committee received numerous requests to initiate construction on many additional projects. However, due to constraints imposed by the congressional budget resolution for 1988 and the construction obligation ceiling instituted by Public Law 99–662, the Committee has had to focus the majority of available resources on ongoing projects in order to optimize program execution and to minimize schedule delays.

In an effort to demonstrate a commitment to non-Federal interests, the Committee has provided funding for the 13 projects requested by the administration. But, again, due to budgetary constraints and other limitations the funding schedules to all new starts have been adjusted to reflect a fourth quarter construction contract award.

COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS AND PROCEDURES

The Committee is concerned with the procedures developed by the Secretary of the Army whereby binding local cost-sharing agreements [LCA] are not executed until after Federal appropriations are made for a project. While the Committee recognizes that the Corps of Engineers is operating for the first time under newly established criteria, it should be pointed out that Public Law 99–662 clearly shifted the burden for commitment to water resource projects away from the Federal Government to the State and local level. Further, the Corps and water development interests have generally known and have been working under this new concept since enactment of the 1985 supplemental appropriations bill in August 1985.

Therefore, the Committee feels that execution of a LCA should occur earlier in the process and that since the preconstruction engineering and design costs are to be cost sharing, this should happen during the PED timeframe. In the future, the Committee will expect the Corps of Engineers to have a LCA executed before the final year of preconstruction engineering and design. In this way, the Committee and the Congress will have a clear picture of a projects status.

REVISED PROJECT CAPABILITIES

As shown in the following table, the Committee has made reductions in the amounts requested in the budget because of revised project capabilities as reported to the Committee by the Corps of Engineers.

Project	Decrease	Reason
Corpus Christi ship channel, TX	$600,000	Favorable bid.
Ray Roberts Lake, TX	4,000,000	Favorable bid.
Vince and Little Vince bayous, TX	787,000	Favorable bid.
Ouachita and Black Rivers, AR and LA	1,800,000	Delay in locals providing right of way.
Harry S. Truman Dam and reservoir, MO	200,000	Favorable bid.
Little Blue River Lakes, MO	450,000	Delay in contractor earnings.
Baltimore Harbor and channels, MD	12,100,000	Favorable bids.
Norfolk Harbor and channels, VA	5,500,000	Favorable bid.
Richmond, VA	5,000,000	Delay in local financing.
Tamaqua, PA	2,100,000	Delay in local financing.
Jonesport, ME	2,000,000	Delay in contract award.
Portsmouth Harbor, NH	500,000	Delay in contract award.
Revere Beach, MA	600,000	Delay in contract award.
Town Brook, Quincy, MA	1,300,000	Delay in contract award.
Bonneville navigation lock, OR	4,000,000	Reduced contract requirement.
Muskingum River lakes, OH	1,700,000	Revised cost estimate.
Turtle Creek, PA	800,000	Lack of local cooperation.
Agana River, GU	500,000	Delay in contract award.
Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, AL	1,250,000	Additional studies required.
Duval County, FL	1,900,000	Reduced contract requirement.
Village Creek, AL	5,000,000	Project reanalysis required.
Little Dell, UT	2,000,000	Delayed contract award.
Phoenix, AZ, and vicinity (stage 2)	15,500,000	Delay in contractor earnings.
Sacramento River deepwater ship channel, CA.	4,600,000	Delay in local financing.

Souris River Basin, ND (Rafferty and Alameda Dams, Saskatchewan, Canada).—The Committee has included $20,500,000, the United States 1988 contribution toward support of construction of the Rafferty and Alameda Dams in Canada.

The Committee fully supports this unique effort between the United States and Canada. The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers has not participated in this type of joint effort in its 163-year history. While being constructed in Saskatchewan, Canada, these projects will provide substantial flood control benefits to several towns in North Dakota and eliminate the need to construct costly local protection measures in this country.

Because of the unique nature of this undertaking, possible savings that could be realized by the United States Government, and in a good faith effort to show United States commitment to the Canadian Government, the Committee has recommended the additional funding needed to support the Canadian construction schedule and a legislative provision clarifying the project authorization to allow the United States contribution to be adjusted for inflation and fluctuations in the exchange rate.

Blue River Lake, OR.—If a non-Federal interest obtains license for non-Federal development of hydroelectric power at the Blue River Lake project, Willamette River basin, OR, as authorized under title VI of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99–662, the Committee notes that the project output will not be considered Federal power.

Clearwater Fish Hatchery, Idaho.—The Committee has provided $4,500,000 for the lower Snake River fish and wildlife compensation

plan in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, including an additional $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to expedite the detailed engineering and design, including the water supply feature, of the Clearwater Fish Hatchery in preparation for construction in fiscal 1989.

Ouachita River Levees, LA.—The Committee is concerned that the existing levee protecting Bawcomville, LA, does not provide a sufficient level of protection to residents of the area. The needed enlargement of the levee is within the scope of the authorized Ouachita River levees, Louisiana, project. Therefore, the Committee has included $120,000 in the bill and directs the Corps of Engineers to plan, design, and initiate construction for the levee enlargement that is needed to complete this important flood control feature.

Kissimmee River restoration, FL.—Section 1135 of Public Law 99–662, authorized the Corps of Engineers to undertake a program to demonstrate to determine if modifications in structures and operations of water resource projects constructed in prior years could improve the quality of the environment in the public interest. The Committee is aware that work undertaken by the Corps of Engineers in prior years may have had an impact on the Kissimmee River ecological system and that local agencies have developed a multipronged approach to address these problems. The Committee believes that the Kissimmee River demonstration project involving phase II river run revitalization, tributary management, and construction of additional weirs should be undertaken in accordance with the provisions of section 1135 and has included $3,000,000 to begin this demonstration project. In carrying out the Kissimmee River restoration, neither phases of the project should impact privately owned lands without compensation which shall be the responsibility of the local agencies.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—The Committee recommendation for the Red River Waterway project includes an additional $16,690,000 to expedite the engineering and design of lock and dam No. 5 concurrently with lock and dam No. 4 and to continue construction. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to take appropriate measures to insure that the engineering and design of these two locks and dams are expedited and completed at the earliest possible time.

Small Continuing Authorities Program.—Because of budgetary constraints and the large backlog of eligible projects, the Committee has continued the practice of not earmarking funding for specific projects. However, the Corps' attention is directed to the following projects for additional review and consideration based on information and requests received—Tongue Point, OR, (section 107); Carter Lake and Bedford, IA, (section 205); Bisbee, AZ, (section 205); St. George Island Harbor (section 107); and Sand Island, HI, (section 103).

Cleveland Harbor, OH.—The Committee is aware of the desire of interested parties to proceed with east harbor entrance deepening and widening, structural repairs, and other improvements at Cleveland Harbor, OH. However, the Committee is concerned that the improve-

ments sought by local interests may not conform with the project authorization contained in Public Law 99–662.

Therefore, the Committee has included $300,000 for the Cleveland Harbor project and directs the Secretary of the Army to prepare a report to document the scope, cost, and justification of work associated with the authorized project in order that cost-saving negotiations may be resumed and completed at the earliest possible time.

Columbia River Basin Fish Bypass Program.—The Committee is strongly supportive of efforts to insure adequate juvenile salmon and steelhead fish passage facilities on the Columbia and lower Snake River Dams. The Committee is also disturbed that the administration and the Corps of Engineers has not placed a higher priority on this work in its budget request. Given the importance and the benefits to be derived from enhanced fish runs in the Columbia and Snake Rivers, the Committee again strongly urges the Secretary of the Army to place a higher budget priority on this work in fiscal 1989.

The Committee has provided additional funds for 1988 for raising the emergency intake closure gates, gantry cranes, and fish barges at Lower Granite and Little Goose Dams; detailed design of collection and bypass facilities at Lower Monumental Dam, including fish screens; design of fish screens and collection and transport channels at Ice Harbor Dam; and construction and testing of standard fish screen and design of prototype longer fish screens at The Dalles Dam.

Little Dell Lake, UT.—The Committee has been informed that additional funds may be needed on the Little Dell Lake project in Utah. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to make appropriate reprogramming adjustments on the project during fiscal year 1988 if warranted.

St. Paul Island Harbor, AK.—The Committee is aware of the urgent need to complete harbor improvements at St. Paul Island in Alaska and that the authorization for the needed improvements was provided in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99–662. The Committee has also been informed of the desire of the city of St. Paul to proceed with the implementation of the harbor project under the provisions of section 204 of Public Law 99–662. The Committee supports this procedure and has provided $3,000,000 in the bill to be applied to reimbursement of the city in accordance with the provisions of section 204. The Corps is directed to provide from within available funds such other amounts as may be required in fiscal 1988.

Trimble Wildlife Replacement Area, Smithville Lake, MO.—A condition of the sale of the Trimble Wildlife Area in Missouri to the Federal Government for the construction of Smithville Lake was the reimbursement of lost revenues, expenses, and improvement made by the Missouri Department of Conservation. Because funds are now needed to begin development of the replacement wildlife area the Committee would have no objection to the Corps of Engineers making $1,570,000 available from prior-year unobligated balances to reimburse the State as authorized.

Levisa/Tug Forks of Big Sandy and Upper Cumberland Rivers, WV.—Given the importance of the Levisa and Tug Forks project to providing needed flood protection to the area, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to take all appropriate steps to keep the project on schedule and to request additional funds, if needed, through the reprogramming process to insure current schedules are met.

Guntersville Lake, AL.—The Committee has provided language to direct the Secretary of the Army to construct, under the authority of section 14, Public Law 79–526, 10,000 feet of streambank protection along the west shoreline of the city of Guntersville, AL, on Guntersville Lake, for the purpose of reducing and eliminating erosion on park lands operated and maintained by the city. Rapid erosion is endangering continued use of the park and its facilities. The total cost for the protection measures are estimated to be $430,000 and the non-Federal cost share shall be in accordance with section 603 of the WRDA 1986 (Public Law 99–662).

Charleston Harbor, Wando River extension, SC.—The Committee has provided $2,200,000 for the Charleston Harbor deepending project in fiscal 1988. Included within the recommendation are funds to begin the engineering and design of the Wando River extension.

Memphis Harbor (Ensley Berm), TN.—Within available funds, the Committee recommends up to $2,500,000 for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to initiate construction to correct the water seepage surrounding the Ensley levee.

Red River emergency bank protection, LA, AR, OK, and TX.—The Committee has included $2,000,000 to continue construction of the Red River emergency bank protection project (1968 and 1976 acts).

Miami River Park, FL.—The Committee has included language in the bill which appropriates $2,500,000 to establish a park area and restore public access along the Miami River in the Allapattah community across from Curtis Park in Florida.

Puerco River and tributaries, Gallup, NM.—The Committee has included a general provision that amends section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 [WRDA], Public Law 99–662, which authorized the flood control project for the Puerco River and tributaries at Gallup, NM. The project was authorized in accordance with the 1981 report of the Chief of Engineers. At the time of authorization, the Corps of Engineers was completing a general design memorandum on the project that maximizes net economic benefits and provides a uniform level of protection to the affected area. The completed report of the district engineer, "Puerco River Levees, General Design Memorandum, Gallup, NM," dated September 1986 resulted in an increase in the total project cost, from $4,190,000 to $7,300,000, taking into account the uniform level of protection and the effects of inflation. Section 902 of the WRDA requires additional congressional approval for projects authorized in the act which exceed by 20 percent or more the total cost set forth in the act. Therefore, it is necessary to increase the authorized project cost for the project. The revised project design

does not materially alter the scope or function of the project as originally authorized.

REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURES

In 1957, the Committee provided the Corps of Engineers the flexibility to reprogram funds to a construction project without prior notification to the Committee when such reprogrammings did not exceed 15 percent of the amount available for the project at the beginning of the fiscal year, except that 25 percent was acceptable when the amount available was $500,000 or less. This policy continues to provide a sound basis for many construction reprogrammings. However, a significant number of the cases where reprogrammings exceed these percentages are the result of settled contractor claims, increased contractor earnings due to accelerated rate of operations, or real estate deficiency judgments, each of which the Corps is legally bound to pay. In such cases, the Committee does not object to the Corps reprogramming its resources to meet these obligations without regard to the percent limitations, not to exceed $5,000,000 in any one case. In addition, for projects which have small amounts of $2,000,000 or less available, including unbudgeted completion projects, the Committee believes that the percent limitations are too small to be practicable in view of the price level changes of the past several decades and does not object to reprogrammings of up to $300,000 annually in such cases. The Committee recommends that these reprogramming changes be initiated for a 2-year test to determine whether they will allow for more responsive and timely actions, reduce mandatory interest charges, and increase operating efficiency.

The Corps of Engineers has also reported quarterly to the Committee all construction project reprogrammings made during the preceding quarter that amounted to $100,000 or more. Because of the price level changes of the past several decades, such reporting has become more extensive and less significant. Accordingly, the Committee directs that future quarterly reports include only reprogrammings of $500,000 or more. This would minimize administrative requirements without sacrificing the Committee's need to be kept informed of significant reprogrammings.

Finally, the Committee reaffirms the policy of using funds from projects that are experiencing nonfunding delays as sources of transfer to projects proceeding on or ahead of schedule. However, once the problems are resolved on the delayed projects, adequate funds are to be made available to those projects so as not to further delay them. Follow-on funding should be through the normal budget process. This policy is intended to provide greater flexibility to the Corps in meeting financial requirements of its construction program.

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	46,200,000	3,701,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
(FC)	BOGGY CREEK, AUSTIN, TX	15,800,000	1,172,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	135,000,000	31,476,000	14,000,000	20,200,000	14,000,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX (1968 ACT)	59,400,000	43,616,000	6,200,000	5,600,000	5,600,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	99,200,000	58,270,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	59,400,000	5,438,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	186,000,000	166,489,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS, TX	27,700,000	525,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX	30,200,000	13,884,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	304,000,000	231,713,000	25,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	123,000,000	51,074,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU, TX	41,300,000	19,237,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOUS, TX	20,100,000	17,953,000	2,147,000	1,360,000	1,360,000
(N)	WALLISVILLE LAKE	58,430,000	25,822,000	---	4,000,000	---
	UTAH					
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	28,300,000	5,945,000	5,500,000	1,750,000	3,000,000
	VERMONT					
(N)	SHELBURN BAY	250,000	---	---	---	250,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	VIRGINIA					
(FC)	HAYSI LAKE	20,900,000	---	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA (55-FT DEEPENING)	161,000,000	4,697,000	12,165,000	6,665,000	6,665,000
(FC)	RICHMOND, VA	72,200,000	2,766,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(BE)	TANGIER ISLAND	2,680,000	90,000	---	2,400,000	---
(FC)	VIRGINIA BEACH STREAMS, CANAL NO. TWO, VA	4,800,000	2,043,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMB)	5,000,000	4,779,000	221,000	221,000	221,000
	WASHINGTON					
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS, WA	403,000,000	366,147,000	3,000,000	5,500,000	3,000,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK & DAM	---	---	---	---	3,263,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR, & ID	177,000,000	134,552,000	3,500,000	4,000,000	4,500,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK & DAM	---	---	---	---	3,498,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK & DAM	---	---	---	---	1,140,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK & DAM	---	---	---	---	290,000
(FC)	MT. ST. HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	152,000,000	32,250,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	43,800,000	2,539,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH	336,000,000	7,700,000	8,000,000	34,000,000	16,000,000
(FC)	KANAWHA RIVER, CHARLESTON	330,000	---	---	60,000	---
(FC)	LEVISA/TUG FORKS OF BIG SANDY & UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, PA, & KY	318,000,000	113,020,000	29,000,000	36,800,000	32,000,000
(FC)	KANAWHA RIVER, ST. ALBANS	242,000	---	---	50,000	---
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	186,930,000	181,229,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCK AND DAM, WV	153,000,000	865,000	1,750,000	1,900,000	1,750,000
	WISCONSIN					
(N)	SAXON HARBOR	47,000	---	---	47,000	---
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES, WI	26,300,000	1,562,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	1,100,000
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SEC. 107)	---	---	10,000,000	12,032,000	10,000,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NAVIGATION PROJECTS	---	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
	SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SEC. 103)	---	---	2,500,000	4,450,000	2,500,000
	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL & RELATED PURPOSES (SECTION 205)	---	---	30,000,000	33,535,000	30,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14)	---	---	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
	SMALL SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS (SEC. 208)	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)	---	---	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	---	---	13,478,000	13,478,000	13,478,000
	DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM	---	---	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	---	-131,205,000	-131,205,000	-131,205,000
	APPLICATION OF PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED FUNDS	---	---	---	-105,547,000	-23,400,000
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL			1,188,000,000	1,150,142,000	1,166,136,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(SP) SPECIAL

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1987	$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	26,000,000
House allowance	26,000,000
Committee recommendation	26,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $26,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies.

This activity provides for flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane or shore protection works. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean drinking water where the source has been contaminated and, in drought distressed areas, provision of adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption. In the event of a major flood or coastal emergency, additional funds will be requested.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1987	$310,797,000
Budget estimate, 1988	317,000,000
House allowance	326,399,000
Committee recommendation	315,130,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−1,870,000
House allowance	−11,269,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $315,130,000, which is $11,269,000 below the House allowance and $1,870,000 under the budget request.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this heading.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
SURVEYS:				
GENERAL STUDIES:				
BOEUF & TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	6,570,000	825,000	825,000	825,000
EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR	2,490,000	430,000	430,000	430,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN (WATER AND LAND RESOURCES), LA.	6,551,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
TUSCUMBIA RIVER BASIN, MS	1,000,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
YAZOO RIVER BASIN, MS	9,440,000	513,000	513,000	513,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, EAST BANK, NATCHEZ AREA, MS	440,000	---	---	180,000
OBION AND FORKED DEER RIVERS AND TRIBS, TN & KY	1,580,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
REELFOOT LAKE, TN	1,255,000	290,000	290,000	290,000
TIPTONVILLE, TN	435,000	104,000	104,000	104,000
COLLECTION & STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	270,000	270,000	270,000
PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:				
BUSHLEY BAYOU, LA	1,140,000	105,000	105,000	105,000
EASTERN RAPIDES & SOUTH-CENTRAL AVOYELLES, LA	4,400,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
LOWER WHITE RIVER (BIG CREEK AND TRIBS), AR	2,550,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
MISSISSIPPI & LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	3,300,000	389,000	389,000	389,000
HORN LAKE CREEK, TN & MS	670,000	211,000	211,000	211,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ST. JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO.....	3,200,000	572,000	572,000	572,000
NONCONNAH CREEK, TN.....	1,400,000	231,000	231,000	231,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....		6,355,000	6,355,000	6,535,000
CONSTRUCTION				
CACHE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, ARK.....	168,000,000	---	---	250,000
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, LA, MS, MO & TN.....	3,008,000,000	84,000,000	84,000,000	84,200,000
EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR.....	10,000,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS CO., ARKANSAS.....	38,400,000	---	1,100,000	500,000
L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR.....	12,700,000	2,182,000	1,500,000	500,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, TN..	1,218,000,000	26,500,000	26,500,000	26,500,000
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA.....	41,000,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO.....	371,000,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(444,000,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, EXCEPT LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT.....	129,700,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	95,300,000	2,645,000	2,645,000	2,645,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, EXCEPT TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT	163,600,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT	55,400,000	455,000	455,000	455,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,423,000,000	37,600,000	37,600,000	37,600,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	136,000,000	3,500,000	7,000,000	5,000,000
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	19,800,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
SARDIS DAM, MS (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	7,100,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(931,827,000)	(27,100,000)	(28,625,000)	(28,625,000)
BACKWATER, MS	239,000,000	225,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	103,000,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
TRIBUTARIES, MS	201,500,000	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS	360,427,000	10,275,000	10,275,000	10,275,000
DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	27,900,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	99,000,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		209,432,000	214,875,000	211,725,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
MAINTENANCE				
BOEUF & TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000
LOWER ARK RIVER (NORTH BANK), AR	---	67,000	67,000	67,000
LOWER ARK RIVER (SOUTH BANK), AR	---	110,000	110,000	110,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR	---	3,572,000	3,572,000	3,572,000
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	671,000	671,000	671,000
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	58,543,000	58,543,000	58,543,000
MAPPING, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	700,000	700,000	700,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, & TN	---	10,630,000	10,630,000	10,630,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	8,587,000	8,587,000	8,587,000
BATON ROUGE HARBOR (DEVIL'S SWAMP), LA	---	285,000	285,000	285,000
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	124,000	124,000	124,000
BONNET CARRE, LA	---	522,000	522,000	522,000
LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	65,000	65,000	65,000
OLD RIVER, LA	---	5,449,000	5,449,000	5,449,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, LA	---	1,389,000	1,389,000	1,389,000
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	2,450,000	2,662,000	2,450,000
BACKWATER, MS	---	293,000	293,000	293,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	79,000	79,000	79,000
ENID LAKE, MS	---	2,595,000	2,645,000	2,595,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	207,000	207,000	207,000
GREENWOOD, MS	---	492,000	492,000	492,000
GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	2,846,000	3,696,000	2,846,000
MAIN STEM, MS	---	762,000	762,000	762,000
SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	2,863,000	3,525,000	2,863,000
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	163,000	163,000	163,000
WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	---	2,086,000	2,086,000	2,086,000
TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	3,749,000	3,749,000	3,749,000
YAZOO CITY, MS	---	310,000	310,000	310,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	2,835,000	2,835,000	2,835,000
MEMPHIS HARBOR (McKELLAR LAKE), TN	---	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	1,059,000	1,059,000	1,059,000
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		116,400,000	118,174,000	116,400,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND PRIOR YEAR UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-13,005,000	-13,005,000	-19,530,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES,		319,182,000	326,399,000	315,130,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:

(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(N) NAVIGATION

Mississippi River, East Bank, Natchez area, MI.—The Committee recommendation includes $180,000 and bill language directing the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Engnieers to complete the reevaluation of alternative plans in May 1988; and submission of the final report on the Mississippi River, East Bank, Natchez area project July 1989.

Mississippi River, Lauderdale County, TN.—The Committee understands that there is no adequate, safe access for small boats along an 83 mile reach of the Mississippi River in west Tennessee.

The Committee has also been informed that the State of Tennessee is willing to provide 50 percent of the $400,000 estimated cost. Therefore, the Committee has included $200,000 under channel improvement for this critical boat launching facility.

St. Francis River and tributaries, AR and MO.—The Committee is aware that due to the failure of the Corps of Engineers to properly maintain Old Ditch No. 61, Arkansas, in the St. Francis River and tributaries, AK and MO, project, the frequency and severity of flooding in this area is increasing and adjacent flood control channels are not operating at the level of efficiency and effectiveness for which they were designed and built. The Committee intends that the Corps, within existing funds, shall perform appropriate channel maintenance, including cleanout, on Old Ditch No. 61 from the Marked Tree, Arkansas, siphons west to the Burlington Northern Railroad bridge and to complete this work not later than October 1, 1988.

Cache River Basin project, AR.—The Committee recommendation includes $250,000 for the Cache River Basin project in Arkansas. The Corps of Engineers is directed to use the funds to reformulate the current authorized plan of improvement for the Cache River Basin with a view toward providing a balanced plan between flood damage reduction and fish and wildlife conservation. Reformulation studies will be fully coordinated with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and will include the use of stream obstruction removal guidelines generally acceptable to environmental agencies. The results of this review shall be submitted to the appropriate committees for action or authorization within 2 years.

Atchafalaya Basin floodway system, LA.—The Committee concludes that in the acquisition of lands, and interests therein, in the Atchafalaya Basin floodway system, the most efficient and economical approach is to acquire all interests in any tract of land at one time. The Committee has analyzed the several proposals presented it and the testimony thereon, and it is apparent that a single acquisition from a single landowner is far more advantageous to the taxpayers of the United States than are multiple acquisitions from the same landowner. The Committee further notes that most of the lands affected by the project will be subject to multiple estates. It, therefore, concludes that it is in the best interest of the United States, and the landowners involved, to consummate these acquisitions as expeditiously as possible by dealing with each landowner only one time.

Since land use changes and development are more likely to occur in the northern part of the basin, the Committee believes that it would be

prudent, less costly, and achieve project purposes to begin acquisition in the northern part and progress toward the south.

Yazoo backwater pumping plant, MS.—The Committee has provided $1,750,000 for the Yazoo backwater pumping plant to complete the design and to develop plans and specifications for the pumps.

Helena Harbor, AR.—The bill includes $1,100,000 for preconstruction engineering and design and initiation of construction of the Helena Harbor, AR, project. The Corps of Engineers is directed to complete the engineering and design on the project before the end of fiscal year 1988.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1987	$1,389,846,000
Budget estimate, 1988	[1] 1,414,738,000
House allowance	[1] 1,413,093,000
Committee recommendation	[1] 1,404,738,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−10,000,000
House allowance	−8,355,000

[1] Reflects transfer of $55,262,000 to General Regulatory Functions.

An appropriation of $1,404,738,000 is recommended, which is $10,000,000 below the budget request and $8,355,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps to divert budgeted operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled emergency maintenance requirements.

Further, the Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch the scarce O&M dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and fiscal constraints reduce budgetary resources, it is clear that the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O&M work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered. However, in optimizing its use of the limited resources available, the Corps should insure maximum public benefits for navigation, hydropower, and flood control.

The 1988 budget request was based on estimates which were developed 18 months ago. Maintenance dredging requirements in navigation channels vary with weather conditions, equipment availability, and usage. Further, good bid experience could free up additional dollars to accomplish unscheduled work. Specific allocations impede the Corps' ability to adjust to continuously changing needs. Only if the Corps' financial flexibility to respond to emergencies and other unanticipated urgent requirements is preserved can the Chief of Engineers carry out his responsibility to perform the O&M work of greatest overall importance to the Nation.

Therefore, the Committee prefers not to make specific allocation to projects and has included tables in the report for illustrative purposes only.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests—the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, Flint Rivers, GA, AL, and FL; Redondo Beach, Kings Harbor, CA, dredging; Bayou Segnette Waterway, LA, dredging from mile zero to mile 12.2; maintenance dredging of the Cohansey River navigation channel in New Jersey; dredging of Dogue Creek (and tributary sloughs) a tributary of the Potomac River in Virginia; maintenance dredging needs along the Houston Ship Channel in Texas, especially Barbour Terminal Channel and Bayport Ship Channel; additional maintenance dredging at Port Orford, OR; maintenance dredging at Milford, CT; and operations and maintenance of streambank erosion control structures constructed as part of the section 32 demonstration program.

Inspection of completed works, Sacramento River flood control project, CA.—The Committee is aware of the need for a comprehensive analysis of the integrity of the flood control system for the Sacramento River and its tributaries. The Committee also believes that an additional $700,000 is warranted to continue this critical work in fiscal 1988.

New York State Barge Canal.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for operation and maintenance, and rehabilitation requirements as authorized by section 1105 of Public Law 99–662.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1988:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
ALABAMA	
ALABAMA-COOSA RIVERS, AL	4,538,000
BAYOU CODEN, AL	18,000
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	51,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	11,756,000
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	33,000
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	131,000
FLY CREEK, AL	81,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (MOBILE DISTRICT), AL	6,252,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM 'BILL' DANNELLY LAKE, AL	3,242,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	7,960,000
PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	48,000
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	2,779,000
TENNESSEE TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	17,192,000
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	5,005,000
ALASKA	
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,953,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	899,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	396,000
HOMER HARBOR, AK	269,000
NOME HARBOR, AK	651,000
STIKINE RIVER SNAGGING, AK	14,000
ARIZONA	
ALAMO DAM, AZ	654,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	902,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	102,000
ARKANSAS	
BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,506,000
BLAKELY MOUNTAIN DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	3,197,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	732,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	5,998,000
DARDANELLE LOCK & DAM, AR	4,807,000
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	2,982,000
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	648,000
DIERKS LAKE, AR	681,000
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	625,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,204,000
HELENA HARBOR, AR	433,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAV SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK	17,930,000
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,593,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	2,247,000
NIMROD LAKE, AR	932,000
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,048,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	350,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	4,948,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK & DAM, AR	3,378,000
WHITE RIVER, AR	1,967,000
CALIFORNIA	
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	3,173,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H. V. EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,121,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA	1,578,000
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	1,150,000
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE & CHANNEL, CA	1,842,000
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	113,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,123,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY, CA	2,322,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,800,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	2,193,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	1,345,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	122,000
MOJAVE RIVER RESERVOIR, CA	205,000
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	60,000
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	30,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	1,658,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,241,000
NEW MELONES LAKE, CA	602,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR, CA	418,000
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	1,428,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS, CA	3,965,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	705,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	1,536,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	1,604,000
REDONDO BEACH, KING HARBOR, CA	---
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	1,954,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	77,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL)	677,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (30 FOOT PROJECT)	560,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY-DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,000,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,545,000
DRIFT REMOVAL (SF HARBOR & BAY), CA	1,570,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,012,000
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	3,077,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	1,683,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	873,000
SANTA CRUZ HARBOR, CA	230,000
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,142,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	913,000
TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA	1,525,000
VENTURA MARINA, CA	1,332,000
YUBA RIVER, CA	125,000
COLORADO	
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	271,000
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	555,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,082,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,332,000
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	576,000
CONNECTICUT	
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	221,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	260,000
CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD, CT	1,083,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	79,000
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	418,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	294,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	221,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	150,000
THOMASTON DAM, CT	461,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	397,000
DELAWARE	
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CHINCOTEAGUE BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, DE	15,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	17,294,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY	31,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	11,685,000
DIST OF COLUMBIA	
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	425,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	62,000
FLORIDA	
APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	97,000
BLACKWATER RIVER, FL	74,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,537,000
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	5,211,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	103,000
CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL, FL	1,779,000
EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	33,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,365,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	320,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO ANCLOTE RIVER, FL	1,929,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	1,303,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	2,573,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	4,292,000
LA GRANGE BAYOU, FL	95,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	127,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,587,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	58,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	979,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	967,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	635,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	36,000
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	85,000
PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL	1,251,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	2,736,000
ST. MARKS RIVER, FL	675,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	2,436,000
GEORGIA	
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE, FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	6,064,000
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,884,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT)	611,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	5,173,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	6,261,000
CARTERS LAKE, GA	2,743,000
CLARKS HILL LAKE, GA & SC	8,571,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	7,315,000
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	3,564,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	8,983,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	352,000
WEST POINT LAKE, GA & AL	5,670,000
HAWAII	
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, OAHU, HI	50,000
IDAHO	
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	3,904,000
DWORSHAK DAM & RESERVOIR, ID	5,934,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	703,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
ILLINOIS	
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	7,100,000
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	2,930,000
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	3,655,000
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	2,911,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	138,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL	26,691,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (LMVD PORTION)	901,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,280,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	3,827,000
MISS RIV BTWN MISSOURI RIV & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI, & IA (LMVD)	11,419,000
MISS RIV BTWN MISSOURI RIV & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI & & IA (NCD)	59,301,000
NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	---
REND LAKE, IL	2,901,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	3,280,000
INDIANA	
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	432,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	390,000
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	100,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	375,000
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE, IN	420,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	441,000
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	10,070,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	391,000
MONROE LAKE, IN	419,000
PATOKA LAKE, IN	398,000
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	424,000
IOWA	
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	3,236,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA & NE	9,705,000
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,541,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,638,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	2,992,000
SMALL NAVIGATION PROJ AT SIOUX CITY IOWA - SEC. 107	5,000
KANSAS	
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,496,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	770,000
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	437,000
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	842,000
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	892,000
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	818,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,239,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,335,000
MARION LAKE, KS	785,000
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,179,000
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,730,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	821,000
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,358,000
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,206,000
TORONTO LAKE, KS	246,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,330,000
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,037,000
KENTUCKY	
BARKLEY DAM - LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	4,594,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,232,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,100,000
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	704,000
CARR FORK LAKE, KY	811,000
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	490,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY	777,000
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	774,000
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	577,000
GREEN & BARREN RIVERS, KY & TN	1,050,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,021,000
HICKMAN HARBOR, KY	470,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	876,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	673,000
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	12,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	540,000
MIDDLESBORO, KY	41,000
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,086,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN & IL	18,187,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, PA, WV, OH, IN, & IL	2,785,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	463,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	999,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	578,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	3,093,000
LOUISIANA	
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK	5,140,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	761,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	305,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	38,000
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	10,000
BAYOU TECHE, LA	370,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	66,000
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	8,180,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	2,175,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION	15,600,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	1,671,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	228,000
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	109,000
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,151,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,383,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	35,820,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	7,840,000
PEARL RIVER, LA	139,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, LA	3,729,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,460,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	112,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
MARYLAND	
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD	13,245,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	85,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	255,000
BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD & WV	1,061,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV, MD & WV	71,000
HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD CREEK	---
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	460,000
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	894,000
MASSACHUSETTS	
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	274,000
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	372,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	243,000
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	5,967,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREAS, MA	146,000
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	149,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	277,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	257,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	545,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	427,000
NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN & ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	122,000
TULLY LAKE, MA	349,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA	220,000
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	316,000
MICHIGAN	
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	57,000
BOLLES HARBOR, MI	29,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI	773,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	1,657,000
CLINTON RIVER, MI (DIKED DISPOSAL)	1,805,000
DETROIT RIVER, MI	6,408,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	177,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR AND GRAND RIVER, MI	909,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	22,000
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	3,408,000
INLAND ROUTE, MI	11,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	1,225,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI (DIKED DISPOSAL)	218,000
LELAND HARBOR, MI	60,000
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	157,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	1,032,000
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	242,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI (DIKED DISPOSAL)	42,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI	1,439,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	726,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	758,000
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	110,000
ROUGE RIVER, MI	422,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	2,173,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI (DIKED DISPOSAL)	6,322,000
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	27,000
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI	834,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,142,000
ST. MARYS RIVER, MI	9,474,000
MINNESOTA	
BIG STONE LAKE AND WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	262,000
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	2,657,000
MISSISSIPPI RVR BTWN MO & MINNEAPOLIS-LD'S 3, SA-9 (MAJ REHAB)	4,100,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKE, MN	398,000
LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX RIVER, MN & SD	390,000
LITTLE FALLS, MN	---
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	432,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	172,000
RED LAKE RIVER, MN	107,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	1,774,000
SAUK LAKE, MN	---

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
ST CROIX RIVER MINNESOTA & WISCONSIN, MN	153,000
WINONA COMMERCIAL HARBOR, MN	20,000
MISSISSIPPI	
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	59,000
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	615,000
CADET BAYOU, MS	48,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	239,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	316,000
ENID LAKE, MS	88,000
GRENADA LAKE, MS	59,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	3,016,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	107,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,110,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,603,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	336,000
SARDIS LAKE, MS	89,000
YAZOO RIVER, MS	73,000
MISSOURI	
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	350,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	4,466,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	6,466,000
HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	6,300,000
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	676,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	506,000
MERAMEC PARK LAKE, MO	475,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	11,029,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MAJOR REHAB, LOCK AND DAM 20, MO	5,600,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER MAJOR REHAB, LOCK AND DAM 22, MO	5,100,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,206,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,117,000
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	2,296,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	4,836,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	479,000
MONTANA	
FORT PECK LAKE, MT	3,970,000
LIBBY DAM (LAKE KOOCANUSA), MT	3,369,000
NEBRASKA	
GAVINS POINT DAM LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	5,743,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,029,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATION RIVER, NE & SD	---
MISSOURI RIVER, KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY	46,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	446,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	862,000
NEVADA	
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	333,000
PINE & MATHEWS CANYONS DAMS, NV	84,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	394,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	309,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	351,000
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	912,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	280,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	277,000
NEW JERSEY	
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,342,000
COHANSEY RIVER, NJ	50,000
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	476,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
DELAWARE RIVER BETWEEN PHILADELPHIA AND TRENTON, NJ & NJ & PA	3,617,000
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	3,389,000
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	5,479,000
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	769,000
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	1,360,000
NEW MEXICO	
ABIQUIU REHABILITATION DAM, NM	1,100,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,160,000
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	4,681,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	143,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	327,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	535,000
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	309,000
NEW YORK	
ALMOND LAKE, NY	273,000
ARKPORT DAM, NY	143,000
BAY RIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	1,000,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,712,000
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,664,000
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	1,397,000
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	250,000
EAST RIVER, NY	1,950,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	1,509,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	284,000
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	---
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	3,281,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY	5,507,000
JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,665,000
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	12,000
MT. MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,490,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, NY & VT	1,089,000
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	2,107,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY & NJ	1,320,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (DRIFT REMOVAL)	3,148,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	3,078,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	562,000
NEW YORK STATE BARGE CANAL	10,000,000
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	12,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	1,120,000
RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	2,200,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	518,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	277,000
NORTH CAROLINA	
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT)	4,628,000
B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	936,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	361,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	2,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	713,000
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	32,000
FALLS LAKE, NC	997,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	---
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	5,356,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	3,128,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	6,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	6,000
OCRACOKE INLET, NC	6,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	84,000
W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,425,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	4,682,000
NORTH DAKOTA	
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	158,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	7,433,000
HOMME LAKE AND DAM, ND	82,000
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	530,000
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	428,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
OHIO	
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	519,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	4,640,000
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,426,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	675,000
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM, OH	393,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	4,493,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	555,000
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	402,000
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	459,000
DILLON LAKE, OH	326,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	545,000
HURON HARBOR, OH	715,000
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,460,000
MASSILLON, OH	15,000
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	549,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	555,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,994,000
NEWARK, OH	15,000
NORTH BRANCH OF KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	204,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	483,000
ROSEVILLE, OH	15,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,360,000
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	9,557,000
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	260,000
WEST FORK MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	306,000
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE, OH	517,000
OKLAHOMA	
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	329,000
CANDY LAKE, OK	12,000
BIRCH LAKE, OK	592,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,434,000
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,243,000
COPAN LAKE, OK	498,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,312,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,367,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	625,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	477,000
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	527,000
HUGO LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	1,179,000
HULAH LAKE, OK	511,000
KAW LAKE, OK	1,350,000
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	2,606,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	3,111,000
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,286,000
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	484,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	9,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	750,000
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK, DAM & RESERVOIR, OK	2,349,000
SARDIS LAKE, OK	579,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	917,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,814,000
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	945,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK & DAM, OK	2,517,000
WISTER LAKE, OK	573,000
OREGON	
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	652,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	133,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM, OR	11,934,000
CHETCO RIVER, OR	430,000
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE RIVS BELOW VANCVR & PORT, OR & WA	11,139,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	7,822,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND THE DALLES, OR & WA	249,000
COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS, OR	162,000
COOS BAY, OR	3,912,000
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	6,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	556,000
COUGAR LAKE, OR	847,000
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,650,000
DORENA LAKE, OR	319,000
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	293,000
FERN RIDGE DAM & LAKE, OR	672,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,896,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	516,000
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	12,141,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	2,286,000
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	2,329,000
MCNARY LOCK & DAM, LAKE WALLULA, OR & WA	9,365,000
PORT ORFORD, OR	257,000
ROGUE RIVER HARBOR AT GOLD BEACH, OR	539,000
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	758,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	388,000
TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR, OR	137,000
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	800,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR	285,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AND WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	515,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	298,000
YAQUINA NORTH JETTY, OR	4,000,000
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,001,000
PENNSYLVANIA	
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	5,646,000
ALVIN R. BUSH DAM, PA	392,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	123,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	547,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	1,344,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	819,000
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	863,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,149,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	401,000
DASHIELDS L/D - MAJOR REHAB, PA	9,800,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, PA, NJ & DE	17,417,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
ERIE HARBOR, PA	27,000
EAST BRANCH, CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	670,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	448,000
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA	454,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR, PA	146,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	593,000
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA & NY	824,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	992,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	760,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL, PA	694,000
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	288,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	7,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	1,869,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	118,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA & OH	1,475,000
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	186,000
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,340,000
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,081,000
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	297,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	596,000
YORK, INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	394,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,353,000
PUERTO RICO	
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	110,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT)	3,317,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	4,861,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,186,000
FOLLY RIVER, SC	20,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	2,914,000
JEREMY CREEK, SC	16,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	133,000
MURRELLS INLET, SC	36,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	44,000
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	537,000
TOWN CREEK, SC	22,000
SOUTH DAKOTA	
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	4,161,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	152,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	101,000
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,688,000
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	8,179,000
TENNESSEE	
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	2,686,000
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	3,620,000
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	2,774,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN & KY	2,469,000
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM & RESERVOIR, TN	1,986,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK & DAM, TN	3,408,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN, AL, & KY	12,496,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	639,000
TEXAS	
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	383,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL (AREA 8)	586,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	705,000
BELTON LAKE, TX	1,474,000
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,975,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	680,000
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,155,000
CANYON LAKE, TX	1,045,000
CEDAR BAYOU, TX	780,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA - GIWW, TX	1,930,000
CHOCOLATE BAYOU - GIWW, TX	1,180,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX (1968 ACT)	4,540,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX & OK	4,641,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	1,906,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	3,390,000
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	8,820,000
GRANGER LAKE, TX	925,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,785,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	8,034,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	602,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL	6,030,000
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	293,000
LAKE KEMP, TX	152,000
LAVON LAKE, TX	1,729,000
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,121,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,115,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,062,000
O. C. FISHER DAM & LAKE, TX	645,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	750,000
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,210,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	260,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	9,171,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	2,438,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,272,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,358,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM AND B.A. STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	692,000
WACO LAKE, TX	1,764,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	170,000
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	2,410,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,669,000
VERMONT	
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	424,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	348,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	491,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	289,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	338,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
VIRGINIA	
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	980,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DISMAL SWAMP CANAL	1,992,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	1,019,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	970,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	892,000
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	186,000
JAMES RIVER, VA	1,310,000
JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC	5,872,000
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM & RESERVOIR, VA	665,000
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	4,349,000
NORFOLK HARBOR, (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	274,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND LAKE, VA	239,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	1,663,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	863,000
WASHINGTON	
ANACORTES HARBOR, WA	178,000
BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	403,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	6,712,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	646,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	2,000
EDIZ HOOK, WA	31,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	826,000
GRAYS HARBOR & CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	4,820,000
HOWARD A. HANSON RESERVOIR, WA	647,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,791,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	3,551,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK & DAM, LAKE BRYAN, WA	4,384,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA & ID	10,233,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,140,000
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	448,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	10,199,000
PUGET SOUND AND ITS TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	610,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	634,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	90,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	92,000
TACOMA - PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	30,000
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, LAKE CELILO, WA & OR	6,954,000
WYNOOCHEE LAKE, WA	1,456,000
WEST VIRGINIA	
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	560,000
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	736,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	888,000
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	821,000
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	275,000
ELKINS, WV	7,000
KANAWHA RIVER, WV	8,220,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, WV, MD & PA	8,524,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS HUNTINGTON, WV	11,625,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK HUNTINGTON, WV	1,503,000
R. D. BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,064,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	485,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,057,000
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,183,000
TYGART RIVER LAKE, WV	881,000
WISCONSIN	
EAU GALLE RIVER, WI	610,000
FOX RIVER, WI	845,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKED DISPOSAL)	5,400,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,567,000
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	146,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	907,000
LAFARGE LAKE, WI	38,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	1,180,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	3,248,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Recommendation (2)
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	265,000
STURGEON BAY AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	741,000
MISCELLANEOUS	
DREDGING RESEARCH PROGRAM (DRP)	3,000,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	5,112,000
INSPECTION OF NON-FEDERAL LEVEES	1,199,000
SCHEDULING FOR FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	2,119,000
MONITOR COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	1,500,000
RIVER ICE MANAGEMENT	1,150,000
REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH (REMR)	6,835,000
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION	
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS AND OBSTRUCTIONS	1,000,000
PROTECTION, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS (SEC. 33)	50,000
GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS	---
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	8,223,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	2,310,000
COMMERCIAL STATISTICS	3,470,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS	10,000,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-27,695,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,404,738,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

1/ SEE NEW APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT -- 'GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS'.

GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS

Appropriations 1987	[1] $50,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	55,262,000
House allowance	55,262,000
Committee recommendation	55,262,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

[1] Included under Operation and Maintenance, General.

The Committee recommendation concurs with the House action creating a new account for general regulatory functions. An appropriation of $55,262,000 is recommended for 1988 which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

The Committee is concerned about the additional costs incurred by the Corps in recent years to administer and manage the general regulatory functions above the amounts both proposed by the President's budget and appropriated by the Congress. The Committee recognizes that the Corps workload on regulatory matters has increased significantly as a result of more restrictions and procedural requirements on nationwide permits, jurisdiction over more isolated waters, additional duties in controlling certain solid wastes and expanded coordination requirements concommitant with the new interagency agreements. Nevertheless, measures must be taken to assure that funds are applied to regulatory work and not to other nonrelated activities. This program does not relate generally or specifically to project operation and maintenance responsibilities. Therefore, the Committee recommends a change in the appropriation structure to remove general regulatory functions from operation and maintenance, general, and create a new appropriation title for that purpose. Accordingly, the bill includes a new appropriation title for general regulatory functions.

In light of workload increases in recent years in certain Corps district offices, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to thoroughly review district regulatory staffing in order to better match manpower requirements with those districts experiencing significant increases in permit applications.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations 1987	$115,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	128,200,000
House allowance	128,200,000
Committee recommendation	128,200,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $128,200,000, which is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the division offices, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1987	$29,409,000
Budget estimate, 1988	11,559,000
House allowance	17,795,000
Committee recommendation	16,945,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+5,386,000
House allowance	−850,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $16,945,000, which is $5,386,000 over the budget request and $850,000 below the House allowance.

All American Canal Relocation, CA.—The Committee is aware of the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to develop procedures for lining earthen irrigation canals without having to dewater the canal in advance of construction and that the technology is ready for demonstration. If successful, this technology has the potential to save substantial sums in both construction, and operating and maintaining irrigation facilities throughout the West.

In addition, the Committee is informed that non-Federal interests have expressed the desire to participate in a demonstration project and to provide a substantial portion of the associated costs. The Committee believes that this technology and the cost-sharing potential compliment administration policy of reducing future construction and O&M costs.

Therefore, the Committee has provided $500,000 to carry this demonstration forward and urges the Bureau of Reclamation to expedite negotiation on a substantial cost-sharing agreement with the Federal share not to exceed 40 percent and to use existing authorities to accept contributed funds to begin the demonstration effort during fiscal 1988. Finally, given the potential budgetary impact of this technology, the Committee believes that follow-on funding should be included in the administrations fiscal 1989 budget request.

HIPLEX.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to continue research work related to cloud seeding and pilot training.

Advanced energy applications.—The Committee has included $195,000 under advanced energy applications to complete the final year of the El Paso Solar Pond project. The Committee understands that this amount will complete the final phase of the project and that no additional funds will be needed in future years.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ARIZONA				
PIMA COUNTY/SANTA CRUZ RIVER GROUNDWATER	PROJ.INV.-M&I	300,000	300,000	300,000
CALIFORNIA				
ALL-AMERICAN CANAL RELOCATION		---	500,000	500,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
KELLOGG UNIT REFORMULATION	ADV.PLNG.	---	75,000	---
DELTA SUPPORT STUDIES		---	583,000	583,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE	PROJ.INV.	---	363,000	363,000
REFUGE WATER SUPPLY	PROJ.INV.	---	25,000	25,000
DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT	PROJ.INV.	---	565,000	365,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE STUDY (CVP)	ADV.PLNG.	---	450,000	450,000
COLORADO				
HIGH MOUNTAIN AQUIFER STUDY	SP.INV.-M&I	170,000	170,000	170,000
PROGRAM RELATED ENGINEERING AND SCIENTIFIC STUDIES	GEN.ENG.& RES	3,540,000	3,540,000	3,540,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Type of project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
IDAHO				
OAKLEY FAN GROUNDWATER & RECHARGE INVESTIGATION.....	PROJ.INV.-I	75,000	75,000	75,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT,NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION EXTEN....	ADV.PLNG.	75,000	75,000	75,000
KANSAS				
KANSAS RIVER BASIN WATER OPERATIONS STUDY.....	SP.INV.-M&I	200,000	200,000	200,000
MONTANA				
MILK RIVER WATER SUPPLY UNIT (P-SMBP).....	PROJ.INV.-I	70,000	70,000	70,000
NEBRASKA				
LOUP RIVER BASIN.....	SP.INV.	---	200,000	200,000
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT (P-SMBP).....	PROJ.INV.	---	500,000	500,000
SOUTH PLATTE-FRENCHMAN PROJECT.....	PROJ.INV.	---	200,000	125,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
NEVADA				
DEEP CARBONATE AQUIFER	PROJ.INV.	---	---	500,000
OKLAHOMA				
EAST CENTRAL OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.	---	250,000	---
KIAMICHI HYDROPOWER STUDY	PROJ.INV.	---	100,000	---
NORTHWEST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.	---	300,000	550,000
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PROJ.INV.	---	350,000	350,000
OREGON				
NO. DOUGLAS CO. COOP.WATER RESOURCES STUDY	SP. INV.	120,000	120,000	120,000
UMATILLA BASIN	ADV.PLNG.	---	365,000	365,000
TEXAS				
SAN JACINTO RIVER PROJECT	ADV.PLNG.	---	200,000	200,000
TEXAS BASIN, BEDIAS PROJECT	PROJ.INV.-M&I	600,000	600,000	600,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
UTAH				
WASATCH FRONT TOTAL WATER MANAGEMENT.....	SP.INV.-M&I	125,000	125,000	125,000
WASHINGTON				
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT.....	PROJ.INV.	---	710,000	710,000
WYOMING				
SEMINOE DAM MODIFICATION.....	SP. INV	90,000	90,000	90,000
VARIOUS				
UPPER SNAKE RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT.....	SP.INV. -I	40,000	40,000	40,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	PROJ.INV-I	875,000	875,000	875,000
FOUR CORNERS WATER ASSESSMENT.....	SP.INV.	---	150,000	---
GENERAL ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH:				
ADVANCED ENERGY APPLICATIONS.....		---	---	195,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	GEN.ENG. & RES	497,000	497,000	997,000
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS:				
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	SP.INV.	250,000	250,000	250,000
GENERAL STUDIES AND SUPPORT.....	SP.INV.	3,000,000	3,350,000	3,000,000
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES				
MP REGION.....	SP.INV.	---	(250,000)	---
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES MP REGION.....	SP.INV.	---	(100,000)	---
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM.....		1,060,000	1,060,000	1,060,000
PAY RAISE.....		472,000	472,000	472,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS AND SAVINGS.....		---	---	-1,095,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....		11,559,000	17,795,000	16,945,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1987	$602,158,000
Budget estimate, 1988	700,158,000
House allowance	704,233,000
Committee recommendation	699,038,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−1,120,000
House allowance	−5,195,000

A new appropriation of $699,038,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $1,120,000 under the budget request and $5,195,000 below the House allowance.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION					
AND					
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS					
ARIZONA					
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT.....	48,833,000	11,600,000	17,333,000	17,333,000	17,333,000
CALIFORNIA					
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	354,749,000	296,980,000	4,644,000	4,644,000	4,644,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.....	1,315,814,000	508,073,000	17,941,000	17,941,000	17,941,000
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,109,613,000	341,831,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	610,458,000	605,589,000	409,000	409,000	409,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM.....	294,051,000	248,583,000	5,105,000	5,105,000	5,105,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	342,501,000	285,734,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
SUISUN MARSH PROTECTION.....	50,000,000	---	---	7,500,000	---

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
COLORADO					
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	251,396,000	56,523,000	8,525,000	8,525,000	8,525,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	82,757,000	30,274,000	11,383,000	11,383,000	11,383,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION	92,600,000	65,506,000	4,085,000	4,085,000	4,085,000
NEBRASKA					
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP	348,610,000	196,104,000	19,470,000	20,470,000	19,470,000
O'NEILL UNIT, P-SMBP	173,200,000	7,693,000	---	500,000	650,000
NEW MEXICO					
BRANTLEY PROJECT	125,685,000	101,284,000	23,264,000	23,264,000	23,264,000
NORTH DAKOTA					
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	1,177,531,000	288,097,000	2,500,000	35,000,000	31,000,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	48,415,000	6,615,000	980,000	980,000	980,000
WEB RURAL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT	100,600,000	67,256,000	2,255,000	15,000,000	15,000,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
WASHINGTON					
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:					
IRRIGATION FACILITIES	3,237,052,000	914,224,000	2,870,000	4,470,000	2,870,000
THIRD POWERPLANT	761,250,000	705,034,000	25,140,000	25,140,000	25,140,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE & PROTECTIVE FACILITIES	35,329,000	23,397,000	6,850,000	6,850,000	6,850,000
WYOMING					
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	63,087,000	20,372,000	11,695,000	11,695,000	11,695,000
VARIOUS					
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT	38,960,000	7,800,000	1,415,000	1,415,000	1,415,000
MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM, TITLE I, CRBSCP	468,082,000	314,037,000	23,984,000	23,984,000	23,984,000
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION			197,848,000	253,693,000	239,743,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
ARBUCKLE PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	3,052,000	623,000	346,000	580,000	580,000
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO	31,045,000	27,689,000	777,000	777,000	777,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT,WA.	88,000,000	69,968,000	4,040,000	4,040,000	4,040,000
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT, COLORADO	2,700,000	---	1,130,000	1,130,000	1,130,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK&LEVEE SYSTEM,AR., CA., NV.	163,297,000	50,755,000	6,242,000	6,242,000	7,942,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACTIVITIES	1,757,000	670,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO	500,732,000	485,673,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000
GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA-CALIFORNIA	78,115,000	76,195,000	944,000	944,000	944,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA	49,782,000	41,325,000	1,067,000	1,067,000	1,067,000
LEADVILLE MINE DRAINAGE TUNNEL, COLORADO	7,696,000	3,105,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	107,220,000	97,175,000	8,281,000	8,281,000	8,281,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA	42,778,000	42,678,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA	27,658,000	5,512,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS	106,763,000	104,745,000	2,018,000	2,018,000	2,018,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS	74,388,000	72,997,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
UNITS OR DIVISIONS, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA	24,230,000	23,339,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	42,836,000	40,443,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA	490,000,000	42,038,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	7,010,000	6,728,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, NEW MEXICO	15,453,000	7,906,000	717,000	717,000	717,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	356,400,000	48,447,000	305,000	305,000	305,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH	98,050,000	95,558,000	124,000	124,000	124,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			35,981,000	36,215,000	37,915,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
COOLIDGE DAM, ARIZONA	1,060,000	500,000	---	---	560,000
CACHUMA PROJECT, BRADBURY DAM, CALIFORNIA	5,050,000	---	35,000	35,000	35,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, IDAHO-WYOMING	82,000,000	29,621,000	24,900,000	24,900,000	31,900,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, LAKE TAHOE DAM, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA	610,000	150,000	94,000	94,000	94,000
NEWTON PROJECT, NEWTON DAM, UTAH	3,093,000	2,375,000	277,000	277,000	277,000
RAPID VALLEY UNIT, PACTOLA DAM, S. DAK. (P-SMBP)	10,705,000	7,103,000	1,670,000	1,670,000	1,670,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA	36,887,000	5,350,000	7,070,000	7,070,000	7,070,000
SAN LUIS UNIT, LITTLE PANOCHE DAM, CALIFORNIA (CVP)	405,000	20,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
SAN LUIS UNIT, LOS BANOS DAM, CALIFORNIA (CVP)	382,000	18,000	23,000	23,000	23,000
SAN LUIS UNIT, O'NEILL DAM, CALIFORNIA (CVP)	1,372,000	---	22,000	22,000	22,000
SEEDSKADEE, FONTENELLE DAM, CRSP, WYOMING	50,760,000	4,786,000	19,545,000	19,545,000	19,545,000
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CASITAS DAM, CALIFORNIA	3,050,000	20,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT, ALTUS DAM, OKLAHOMA	6,001,000	1,597,000	790,000	790,000	790,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	5,049,000	2,711,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY	62,139,000	27,902,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	5,000,000	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS			62,938,000	62,938,000	70,498,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
MOON LAKE PROJECT, UTAH	400,000	---	49,000	49,000	49,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, HEART MOUNTAIN DIVISION, WYOMING	5,500,000	5,197,000	303,000	303,000	303,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT, UTAH	7,613,000	6,528,000	1,074,000	1,074,000	1,074,000
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, COLORADO	5,618,000	4,342,000	862,000	862,000	862,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT			2,288,000	2,288,000	2,288,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			299,055,000	355,134,000	350,444,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
ANIMAS LA-PLATA PROJECT	331,791,000	5,931,000	1,955,000	6,155,000	3,000,000
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT	129,345,000	110,154,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
DOLORES PROJECT	411,842,000	269,250,000	11,047,000	11,047,000	11,047,000

Garrison Diversion Unit, ND.—The Committee believes that in light of the enactment of the Garrison Diversion Unit Reformulation Act of 1986, the Garrison Diversion Unit should be funded at a level of $31,000,000, instead of the $2,500,000 requested by the Bureau for fiscal year 1988.

The Committee takes exception with the House Committee earmarks for various purposes related to the Garrison project. As an example, the House has earmarked not less than $10,000,000 for the Southwest pipeline project which the Committee believes inappropriate. It should be pointed out that the Reformulation Act left the decision on the allocation of M,R&I water development projects to the Garrison Conservancy District and the State water commission.

From funds appropriated for the Garrison Diversion Unit, $2,000,000 is for studies of water development and irrigation feasibility at the Standing Rock Sioux and Fort Berthold Reservations.

The Committee further directs that out of the funds appropriated for the Garrison Diversion Unit, such funds be expended for fish and wildlife activities and mitigation as may be necessary to place such features on a basis concurrent with project features.

Yuma groundwater wells, AZ.—The Committee has included an additional $1,700,000 for the Colorado River front work and levee system project for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the installation well to reduce groundwater levels resulting from high Colorado River flows. The increased funding allows the start of installation of 10 additional wells over 2 years.

Farwell Irrigation District, NE.—The Committee has considered a request to include a provision in the bill which would relieve the Farwell Irrigation District of its contractual obligation to repay the Federal Government of certain irrigation and drainage costs. It should be pointed out that the Committee has been faced with numerous situations recently where local interests have indicated that they can no longer afford to pay O&M and other project costs. The Committee believes, however, that relieving the Farwell Irrigation District of its commitment will have significant impact nationwide on the many thousands of other instances where contracts require the repayment of funds expended by the Federal Government. Many other entities would expect the same treatment accorded Farwell Irrigation District if approved. Because of the policy and budgetary implication, the Committee cannot recommend inclusion of legislative language setting aside the repayment cost agreed to by the Farwell District. The Committee believes that the Bureau of Reclamation should prepare a report on this problem and forward it to the cognizant authorizing committees.

Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Upper Colorado River Basin, CO, UT, and WY.—The Committee has been informed of the need to implement a comprehensive recovery program for endangered fish species in the Upper Colorado River Basin. The Committee further believes that the cooperative efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Widlife Service, the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming and vari-

ous environmental organizations produced a good agreement and program for conserving the three endangered fish species identified in the Colorado River Basin.

Because of limited budgetary resources and the need to fulfill NEPA responsibilities, identify available water rights, and execute appropriate cooperative agreement among the parties, the Committee can recommended only $2,800,000 to initiate acquisition and appropriations of water rights in fiscal 1988. Language has also been included in the bill to charge these expenditures related to this fish recovery program to the increased amount authorized to be appropriated under the Colorado River Storage Project Act, as provided by section 501(A) of the Colorado River Basin Act of 1968.

Central Arizona Project.—As the result of an agreement between several environmental organizations and the Arizona Congressional Delegation, the Committee has included language in the bill which eliminates Cliff Dam on the Verde River from plan 6 of the Central Arizona Project.

Without Cliff Dam, safety of dams work at Horseshoe and Bartlett Dams (which Cliff would have largely precluded), must be accomplished to protect downstream residents of the Phoenix metropolitan area as well as the interests of the United States. The Committee instructs the Bureau to proceed expeditiously with a safety of dams modification report for Horseshore and Bartlett Dams and allocates $1,000,000 of the amount recommended for the Central Arizona Project for this purpose.

Language included in the bill acknowledges that additional flood control measures may be needed on the Verde River and that the addition of flood control measures at Bartlett and/or Horseshoe Dams may be required to meet such needs. The Committee is cognizant of the incidental flood control benefits provided by these structures in 1978, 1979, and 1980 and directs the Secretary of the Interior to consider those benefits in the modifications determined to be reasonably required to preserve the structural safety of the Bureau of Reclamation dams on the Verde River. The Committee has allocated $500,000 for CAP funding for the Department of the Interior, working in cooperation with the Department of the Army, to undertake flood control studies to determine feasible flood control measures at Horseshoe and/or Bartlett Dams. In order to complete safety of dams and flood control studies in a timely manner, the Committee directs the two departments to quickly enter into agreements which outline complementary tasks and time schedules. To the extent possible, both agencies should make use of relevant data from existing studies. The Bureau of Reclamation shall proceed immediately with its safety of dams report and simultaneously, the Corps of Engineers shall undertake its flood control analysis, which shall not include consideration of a structure or structures on the Salt River, at or above the confluence of the Salt and Verde Rivers. Under the Upper Gila River and Tributaries authority, the Corps of Engineers shall study and determine flood control meas-

ures downstream from Bartlett Dam on the Verde River to Granite Reef Dam and from the confluence of the Verde and Salt Rivers through metropolitan Phoenix, which together with previously identified flood control modifications to Bartlett and/or Horseshoe Dams, will provide an economically feasible and comprehensive approach to flood control which shall comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.

The water supply that was to be provided by Cliff Dam needs to be replaced so that the Cliff yield, contracted for by local communities, is provided and contributions from non-Federal entities under the Arizona cost-sharing agreement continue. The amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire water rights and lands associated with such rights for municipal and industrial purposes, consistent with existing water rights. The Committee directs that, if the Secretary acquires Colorado River water under this authority, such water be conveyed through the previously authorized diversion and distribution system of the Central Arizona Project. If the Secretary acquires water from any different source which requires construction of additional storage or major diversion works, as determined by the Secretary, such construction will require separate authorization by Congress. Mitigation, which may be required under existing law, of adverse impacts to fish and wildlife habitat resulting from the acquisition of water rights by the Secretary, to the extent feasible, should be undertaken concurrently with the implementation of this new authority.

The Committee supports the continuing commitments of local jurisdictions to provide up front contributions to finance water supply improvements, and directs the Secretary to use all funds contributed by non-Federal entities pursuant to the 1987 supplemental agreement for funding of plan 6 facilities of the Central Arizona Project. The Committee also supports the commitment of the United States to complete all features of plan 6, as modified, using all available Federal resources.

The Committee has removed language which appears in the House provision relating to fish and wildlife mitigation activities for Cliff Dam. Any funds requested for environmental studies and mitigation work common to all features of plan 6, shall be available to continue required environmental studies.

The Committee acknowledges the progress made to date by the Bureau of Reclamation toward remedial repairs for safety of dams purposes at Theodore Roosevelt and Stewart Mountain Dams on the Salt River and urges the Bureau to maintain its preconstruction and construction schedules.

Finally, all parties are to be commended for their efforts in reaching an agreeable solution to the Cliff Dam controversy and thereby eliminating the potential for extended delays and higher project costs. The Committee urges the Department to do everything it can to expedite the identification of flood control and water replacement alternatives for Salt River Valley communities so that commitments made between Arizona water entities and the Department of the Interior in the Arizona cost-sharing agreement can be met.

Central Utah project.—The Committee has provided $120,000,000, the same as included by the House for the Central Utah project. The amount recommended for 1988 is $36,000,000 more than the current year.

The Committee has also included a limitation in the bill which provides that not more than $18,500,000 of total annual appropriations for the Central Utah project may be expended for all administrative expenses and requires that the inspector general of the Department of the Interior annually audit expenditures by the Bureau of Reclamation to determine compliance with this limitation.

The intent of this section is to limit the annual administrative costs as a proportion of total project appropriations. Administrative costs are all noncontract costs both direct and indirect associated with the construction of project facilities. The objective is to maximize to the greatest extent possible the percentage of each annual appropriation that is expended on the construction of project facilities and features.

There is continued concern about the level of overhead associated with the construction of the Bonneville unit. Last year the Committee directed that administrative expenses be limited to 20 percent of project appropriations. However, during this fiscal year, the Bureau's noncontract contract costs are currently estimated to be 24 percent of the total amount appropriated for the project. Therefore, a limitation of noncontract costs to $18,500,000 is expected to eliminate future problems and allow the project to proceed in a more efficient manner.

Finally, the Committee directs the Bureau to confine its actions necessary to conform to this limitation to the Central Utah project.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1987	$140,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	154,297,000
House allowance	154,797,000
Committee recommendation	154,297,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	−500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $154,297,000, which is the same as the budget request.

The fiscal year 1988 budget provides for operation and maintenance and associated work on 34 projects. The program also provides for the negotiation and administration of water marketing contracts; soil and moisture conservation; flood control operations at a number of water user operated reservoirs; water management and construction; and examination of existing structures, et cetera.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1987	$37,480,000
Budget estimate, 1988	28,809,000
House allowance	41,574,000
Committee recommendation	30,809,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+2,000,000
House allowance	−10,765,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $30,809,000. This is $10,765,000 below the House allowance and $2,000,000 over the budget request.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

The Committee is informed that the work under the Ak-Chin small reclamation loan phase I and phase II are likely to exceed the amount of the loan commitment requiring an escalation in funding. It is the Committee's understanding that the obligation to repay such escalated costs as may be expended for that purpose under the SRPA Program are subject to discharge by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the authority provided in section 3(a)(4) of Public Law 98–530, after review and approval of applications for escalation amounts for these contracts.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	1,628,161,000	676,725,000	134,474,000	120,000,000	120,000,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT	197,544,000	5,822,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT	75,691,000	59,626,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
UNITS:					
MODIFICATIONS & ADDITIONS TO COMPLETED FACIL	24,783,000	13,666,000	396,000	396,000	396,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	171,514,000	110,840,000	3,236,000	3,236,000	3,236,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES	204,706,000	53,778,000	600,000	600,000	3,400,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			160,408,000	150,134,000	149,779,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS.....	277,753,000	126,924,000	73,872,000	73,872,000	73,872,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF).....	3,014,170,000	1,671,598,000	191,228,000	152,498,000	152,498,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA-SAFETY OF DAMS.....	198,050,000	2,625,000	3,630,000	3,630,000	3,630,000
VARIOUS					
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM.....	---	---	8,458,000	8,458,000	8,458,000
PAY RAISE.....	---	---	4,286,000	4,286,000	4,286,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-40,779,000	-43,779,000	-43,929,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.....			700,158,000	704,233,000	699,038,000

LOAN PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
ARIZONA					
GILA RIVER FARMS SUPPLEMENTAL	6,554,000	3,016,000	1,646,000	1,646,000	1,646,000
CALIFORNIA					
ELSINORE VALLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT	25,975,000	1,000,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
OAKDALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT	17,774,000	17,151,000	253,000	253,000	253,000
RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT (ESCALATION)	18,591,000	19,342,000	1,435,000	1,435,000	1,435,000
RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT	20,268,000	6,196,000	8,640,000	8,640,000	8,640,000
RAMONA MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT	25,708,000	12,141,000	6,789,000	6,789,000	6,789,000
SANTA ANA WATERSHED PROJECT AUTHORITY	14,714,000	8,842,000	2,172,000	2,172,000	2,172,000
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY - DAY CREEK	13,412,000	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
UNITED WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT	18,156,000	---	---	5,500,000	2,000,000
COLORADO					
STAGECOACH	7,037,000	---	---	6,265,000	1,000,000

LOAN PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
TEXAS					
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO. 1 SUPPL.....	12,972,000	991,000	2,009,000	2,009,000	2,009,000
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO. 2 (SAN JUAN)...	16,100,000	16,042,000	56,000	56,000	56,000
DELTA LAKE IRRIGATION DISTRICT.....	10,982,000	10,807,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
WASHINGTON					
GREATER WENATCHEE IRRIGATION DISTRICT.....	6,563,000	3,921,000	2,627,000	2,627,000	2,627,000
VARIOUS					
CONSTRUCTION COST INCREASES.....	6,299,000	1,299,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
ADMINISTRATION OF THE LOAN PROGRAM.....	40,937,000	36,466,000	710,000	710,000	710,000
PAY RAISE.....	---	---	9,000	9,000	9,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-3,112,000	-3,112,000	-5,112,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....			28,809,000	41,574,000	30,809,000

LOAN PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriations, 1987	($43,806,000)
Budget estimate, 1988	(27,472,000)
House allowance	(40,237,000)
Committee recommendation	(29,472,000)
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+2,000,000
House allowance	−10,765,000

The Committee recommends a loan limitation of $29,472,000, which is the same as the budget request.

The limitation provides a control over the principal amount of loans that may be made under the Loan Program in fiscal year 1988.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1987	$51,200,000
Budget estimate, 1988	53,290,000
House allowance	53,290,000
Committee recommendation	53,690,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+400,000
House allowance	+400,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $53,690,000, which is an increase of $400,000 over the budget request and House allowance.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the Reclamation Program as performed by the Commissioner's office, Denver Engineering and Research Center, and other offices in the six regions.

The recommendation includes up to $400,000 to support the 16th Congress on Large Dams. The United States has not hosted this event in 30 years and will not do so again for a comparable period of time.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriations, 1987	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,000,000, which is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

This fund is used to assure continuous operation of all projects and project facilities governed by the Federal reclamation law in the event of drought, canal bank failures, electrical system failures, municipal and industrial water delivery system failures, or other emergencies.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Committee has concurred with the House language relating to contracts for surveying and mapping services. However, the Committee understands that the Federal acquisition regulations have recently been revised to require that quality be included as an evaluation factor in all negotiated acquisitions.

Therefore, in prescribing the evaluation factors to be included in each solicitation for competitive proposals, the Bureau of Reclamation shall clearly establish the relative importance assigned to the quality of the services to be provided (including technical capability, management capability, and prior experience of the offeror).

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities; uranium supply and enrichment activities; general science and research activities; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the Geothermal Resources Development Fund.

COORDINATION TO IMPROVE COMPETITIVENESS

The Committee recognizes that a critical component of the Nation's drive to improve its competitive posture in the world arena is a technologically oriented and educated population. The Department of Energy maintains our Nation's great scientific capability and has a major role to play in achieving these goals. The national laboratories are an invaluable resource of mathematical, scientific, and engineering expertise that should be tapped to promote joint scientific and technological ventures with industry and academia and to improve the education of America's youth. The Committee, therefore, urges the Department, and specifically the national laboratories, to actively seek areas of cooperation with the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education to coordinate and maximize the use of the Nation's research dollars, facilities, and manpower in such joint ventures.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1987	$1,048,876,000
Budget estimate, 1988	1,677,317,000
House allowance	1,742,567,000
Committee recommendation	1,775,814,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+98,497,000
House allowance	+33,247,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1987	$287,055,000
Budget estimate, 1988	232,393,000
House allowance	310,693,000
Committee recommendation	280,393,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+48,000,000
House allowance	−30,300,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,056,207,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences and environmental and biological research are also included.

These programs address the development of longer term energy supply options to provide the energy resources needed for sustained national growth and to alleviate our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign oil.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

The administration proposes major reductions from the fiscal year 1987 level of funding for solar and renewable energy activities. The budget request would accelerate the downward trend in these programs which have been substantially curtailed over the last 6 years. As in the past, the technology development would be focused on long-term research and development.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar technologies. Most solar and renewables research, however, has not been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers the continuation of activities in solar energy research and development to be a vital component in a balanced energy program. To more broadly utilize this large potential resource base, DOE should pursue technological opportunities which can result in viable energy options for the country. With a sustained commitment of the scientific and engineering talents in government and private sector organizations, research progress can establish the knowledge and materials base required for the effective appliction of a new generation of solar technologies.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends program funds and staffing levels to assure progress in this research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $105,102,000, which is $18,430,000 below funding for this year and $33,927,000 above the budget request.

Solar building systems.—The Committee recommends $5,400,000 for solar building energy research, $528,000 below the level of operating expenses in the current year and $600,000 below the House allowance.

The recommendation includes up to $1,500,000 to continue the ongoing government-industry partnership effort to solve cooling and dehumidification problems in commercial and residential buildings.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The recommendation includes $39,000,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, which is $4,000,000 above the House allowance. This recommended funding will continue the highest priority requirements needed to continue progress in reducing costs and improving efficiencies of photovoltaic systems.

As in the past years, the Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, materials research, technology development, and systems development.

The Committee concurs in the House allowance of up to $1,500,000 to add a semiconductor device design and development component to the present thin-film materials research program and the recommendation for ongoing research in materials, collectors, systems research, and innovative concepts.

No funds are recommended for the Photovoltaic Utility Scale Application [PVUSA] project for fiscal year 1988. The Committee is concerned that the PVUSA project would absorb a disproportionate share of the funds available to the detriment of a balanced program of research and development in photovoltaic technologies. Budgetary constraints and reduced appropriations allocations for the foreseeable future would require that the priority core R&D programs be cut further to make room for the growing, out-year appropriation requirement for such a large demonstration project. This would be unacceptable to the industry and the Committee and would be to the detriment of the photovoltaic program as a whole. A current funding priority is for component and system R&D activities that are necessary to ensure the availability of the next generation PV technologies for installation and testing in this program. This will be of direct benefit to the future implementation of economic, large-scale, utility-oriented photovoltaic power systems. These activities also provide a balanced approach to the continued development of the PV technology base available to industry.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommends $18,038,000 for solar thermal energy, $3,950,000 over the budget request and $4,822,000 below the fiscal year 1987 level. The goal of this program is to advance the engineering and scientific understanding of solar thermal technology and to establish the technology base from which private industry can develop solar thermal production options for introduction into the energy market. These funds are to be applied to collection technology, energy conversion technology, and systems and application technology. The Committee directs the Department to report to the Committee, within 6 months, its activities and plans to bring the Department's research results to the marketplace.

Biofuels energy systems.—The Committee recommends $20,555,000 for the biofuels program in fiscal year 1988, $9,900,000 over the budget request and $3,500,000 more than the House allowance.

The goal of this program is to conduct research that will provide the technology to increase the supply of domestically available feedstocks and convert those feedstocks plus wastes to liquid and gaseous fuels.

The recommendation provides $4,000,000, the same as the current year, to continue the regional Biomass Energy Program, and $500,000 for the Hawaii Biofuels Program, which is also the same amount provided in fiscal year 1987. These regional programs include activities related to technology transfer, industry support, resource assessment, and matching local resources to conversion technologies.

Because of budgetary constraints, the Committee has not included the additional funds provided by the House for an expanded Hydrogen Production Technology Program. The Committee does not believe that funding for an expanded program can be sustained in the future, and at the same time, maintain adequate funding in the future, for other, higher priority efforts in the overall program. Accordingly, the allocation is for $1,200,000, the same as the current year, to be made available in the same manner as provided for in fiscal year 1987.

The House allowance for research in biomass bioprocessing and in field membrane-based technologies are more appropriately conducted under the Energy Biosciences Program in Basic Energy Sciences, Office of Energy Research.

Within available funds, the Committee recommends up to $1,000,000 to continue the Wood Burning Gas Turbine Program.

The Department should ensure that its programs are coordinated with other Federal programs, including Agricultural Research Service, Forest Service, and National Science Foundation.

Wind energy systems.—The recommendation provides $8,540,000 for wind energy systems, the same as the budget request. The $1,000,000 House allowance for Mod-5 testing is not needed due to the $1,200,000 fiscal year 1987 supplemental appropriation.

Ocean energy systems.—The Committee provides $4,000,000 for ocean energy systems, $1,000,000 over the budget request and $2,500,000 less than the House allowance. The objective of the Ocean Energy Program is to develop a generic technical data base and reduce the technical risks associated with the extraction and use of ocean-derived energy sources to the point that allows industry to judge where and when the technology could be commercialized. The recommendation provides $4,000,000, of which up to $2,500,000 is to continue the PICHTR-OTEC project.

Other solar programs.—The recommendation includes $9,569,000 for other solar activities. This amount includes funds for program direction and support, technology transfer activities; and $1,000,000 for the International Solar Energy Program to maintain industry export promotion programs mandated by the Committee on Renewable Energy, Commerce, and Trade [CORECT]. Additional sums should be allocated to this effort as needed during fiscal year 1988. No additional funds are provided for the Inquiry and Referral Service.

GEOTHERMAL

The Geothermal Research and Development Program is aimed at resolving technical problems that preclude the private sector from fully developing our vast geothermal resources. The Committee recommends $21,435,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $5,500,000 over the budget request and $3,200,000 less than the House allowance.

Geothermal resources include steam, hot water, geopressured methane, hot dry rock, and magma. The geothermal energy research and development program is aimed at resolving the technical problems which include uncertainties in determining size and life of reservoirs, unusually high drilling costs and lack of well stimulation techniques, the need for injection technology for economic disposal of spent brines, major corrosion and materials problems, environmental problems, and lack of efficient components.

The Committee recognizes the complex nature of the geothermal resource base and the need for developing improved analytical and testing capabilities. The Committee supports continuation of research activities to improve the tools and methods available for addressing the technical challenges associated with locating, evaluating and extracting geothermal resources.

Hydrothermal industrialization.—The Committee includes $1,000,000 to continue a minimal effort in the hydrothermal area. These funds will assist States with significant hydrothermal resources to continue programs relating to resource assessment, resource development, technical assistance, and related activities.

Geopressured resources.—The recommendation includes $5,000,000 for geopressured resources, $2,300,000 over the budget request and the same as the House. These funds are provided in fiscal year 1988 to continue the existing contract work in three field wells: Pleasant Bayou, Hulin and Gladys McCall, to be used to resolve technical issues on production of hydrocarbons and brine, and generation of electricity using the energy content of the produced fluids.

Geothermal technology.—The Committee recommends $14,600,000 for geothermal technology activities, an increase of $2,200,000 over the budget request. Again, budgetary constraints and deficit reduction allocations require the Committee to reduce the additional funds approved by the House for an expanded research effort in the Hot Dry Rock Technology Program. The Committee does not believe it should initiate new efforts, under current constraints, with little likelihood that it can continue to fund these efforts in the future. Therefore, an additional amount of only $2,200,000 is provided for the Fenton Hill project. Over $100,000,000 has been expended in connection with this effort over many years. The Department should advise the Committee within 6 months as to whether the effort at Fenton Hill should be continued or phased down. If it is recommended for continuation, a funding profile to accomplish the long-term flow test should be provided the Committee as soon as possible.

The Committee agrees with the House Committee and likewise has followed with interest efforts to develop and focus the Department's geosciences program. The Committee also urges the Department to draw up a national research plan for all of its geosciences programs. In so doing, the Department should take into account the research recommendations of the Energy Research Advisory Board and it should consult with the major institutions of hydrocarbon geoscientific research.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The Committee recommends $27,770,000 for energy storage and electric energy systems, the same as the House and $13,770,000 over the request.

The electric energy systems and storage program includes research in determining the effects of electric power transmission on humans and animals; development of technology for improving the reliability of the transmission and distribution of electricity; and research and development in systems technology and thermal and chemical storage.

The electric energy systems program is mainly applied research. That is, research to advance the state-of-the-art in electric system concepts and technologies. This means that virtually all projects have a known objective or application, with the research carried to proof-of-concept and risks understood. Electric energy storage systems include battery, thermal and mechanical and chemical storage.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $15,270,000 is provided for electric energy systems, which is $8,770,000 over the budget request and $4,000,000 more than the House allowance.

The Committee notes with interest recent developments in materials that exhibit superconducting characteristics at higher temperatures and the previous superconductivity work of this program related to electricity generation, transmission and storage.

To address the importance of superconductivity developments, the Committee provides $4,000,000 to conduct research leading to electric system applications of high temperature superconducting technology that until recently would not have been possible.

The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $4,770,000 for program activities of the Hawaii deep water cable project. The major program activities to be initiated in fiscal year 1988 include the fabrication of 33,000 feet of test cable outfitting a cable-laying vessel with control equipment required for at-sea test; preparation for conduct of the at-sea test under actual conditions in the Alenuihaha Channel; and preparation of final reports.

Energy storage systems.—An amount of $12,500,000 is included for energy storage, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request.

The allowance includes $4,500,000 for the technology base electrochemical energy storage research efforts managed and executed by the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory. The sum of $1,900,000 is included for the development of the long-lived zinc-bromine battery for utility load-leveling and the allowance supports the continuation of funding for the

aluminum-air battery system at the fiscal year 1987 level of $1,050,000. The Committee has not included the additional $4,000,000 for thermal energy storage including $2,000,000 for seasonal storage provided in the House allowance due to budgetary constraints.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAM

The Committee believes that nuclear fission remains an important option for meeting our electric energy requirements and maintaining a balanced national energy policy. The Committee continues to strongly support the Nuclear Energy Program.

A total of $610,770,000 is provided for the Nuclear Energy Program, $11,000,000 below the House and $20,100,000 above the budget request.

Light water reactors.—An amount of $32,000,000 is recommended for improved LWR technology, which is $2,000,000 below the House allowance. The budget request would provide $34,000,000 for LWR research, including $8,000,000 for safety and licensing activities, $18,000,000 for advanced LWR technology, and $8,000,000 for TMI activities. The Committee continues to support the Department's light water reactor programs. The Department's cooperative program on safety and licensing and advanced light water reactor technology should be conducted to maximize the opportunities for development and licensing certification of advanced light water reactors.

A general reduction of $2,000,000 is recommended due to the phaseout of TMI activities.

Advanced reactor research and development.—The Committee recommends $96,570,000 for advanced reactor R&D, the same as the House allowance and $25,900,000 over the budget request. The Committee concurs with the House and includes $25,000,000 for the high temperature gas reactor [HTGR] program, $25,900,000 for the integral fast reactor [IFR] which represents a $5,000,000 increase over the budget request, and $5,000,000 for the nuclear fuel cycle program to focus on international collaboration and remote technology. In addition, the allowance includes $3,500,000 for the Advanced Control Test Operation [ACTO] Program.

Space and defense power systems.—The Committee recommends $77,500,000 for space and defense power systems, an increase of $29,220,000 over the current year and $18,500,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides funds for the SP–100 program operating and capital expenses; for isotope power systems and for the multimegawatt power systems, including continued development of thermionic technology. The Committee is advised that thermionic concepts for space power systems show great promise for systems that can meet power requirements from a few kilowatts to multimegawatts. The Thermionic Fuel Element [TFE] Verification Program is producing essential data and should be fully funded. A thermionic technology program that focuses on lower power requirements should also be pursued.

The Committee also agrees with the House Committee recommendation and, consistent with reductions in the Department of Defense and Department of Energy strategic defense initiatives, has reduced this program by $10,000,000. In addition, as a result of the Department of Defense withdrawal from the multimegawatt terrestrial power plant project, no funds are included for this activity in the fiscal year 1988 allowance for the Department of Energy.

A general reduction of $2,000,000 is also recommended for this program.

Advanced nuclear systems.—The Committee recommends $22,000,000, the same level as the House allowance and $1,400,000 over the fiscal year 1987 funding level. These funds are used to provide support for NASA missions.

Facilities.—The recommendation includes $119,700,000 for DOE nuclear facilities operation and activities, the same as the House and $16,700,000 over the budget request level.

No changes are recommended to the House allowance included in the bill as follows: The allowance includes $52,100,000 for the operation of the nuclear facilities in support of the integral fast reactor and operated by the Argonne National Laboratory, a $10,000,000 increase over the budget request.

The allowance includes $2,700,000 to complete the passive safety tests at the Fast Flux Text Facility [FFTF] at Hanford, WA. In addition, $2,000,000 is provided to ensure that sufficient fuel is available to support FFTF operations including 60 subassemblies to be used as a backup. The sum of $2,000,000 is provided to perform an active nonnuclear lay up of the secure automated fabrication line at Hanford. This would allow the facility to go through a testing period before being mothballed. The Committee also urges the Department to use available funds to maintain the international collaboration program in materials and fuel development at FFTF.

Remedial actions.—The total of $249,500,000 for remedial actions and waste stabilization and disposal activities is $2,000,000 below the budget request and $7,000,000 less than the House.

The recommendation of the Committee provides $23,000,000 for the Remedial Action Program, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

For the Uranium Mill Tailings Program, the Committee provides $114,000,000, a decrease of $2,000,000 from fiscal year 1987.

For the Surplus Facilities Management Program, the recommendation is $51,000,000, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Committee understands the Department agrees that A and B cells in the 324 building at Hanford require cleanup and there is a need for these cells in support of the Hanford Waste Vitrification Program. Accordingly, the Committee directs that funding be allocated for the beginning of this cleanup campaign from this program.

A number of concerns have been brought to the attention of the Committee in connection with the alternatives for disposal of uranium mill tailings at Grand Junction, CO. In selecting a final alternative for disposal of the uranium mill tailings at Grand Junction, the Department of Energy shall take into consideration the impacts of the method of transportation selected, including but not limited to: the negative economic impact on the community; the adverse transportation impacts caused by haul route traffic on arterial roads and highways, including traffic safety; and the projected damage to streets and highways along the haul route.

Civilian waste.—The Committee includes $5,000,000 for civilian waste research and development which is not funded through the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund. This is the same as the budget request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The Committee recommends $70,000,000 for environment, safety, and health activities, an increase of $7,986,000 over the current year level of funding and the same as the House allowance.

The Environment, Safety and Health [ES&H] Program was established to assure protection of the environment, safety of DOE workers and the public, and protection of DOE property. The ES&H Program implements these goals by defining DOE policy, providing guidance and technical assistance, performing safety-related research of a generic nature and performing independent overview and assessment.

The House allowance provides for a $500,000 increase in ORNL ecosystem response activities. This should be considered in the Biological and Environmental Research Program.

LIQUEFIED GASEOUS FUELS SPILL TEST FACILITY

The Committee provides $1,000,000 to continue to provide baseline operations support for facility maintenance and technical interaction with potential sponsors of research.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends $243,000,000 for biological and environmental research, $49,000,000 over the current rate and $17,000,000 less than the House allowance.

This program has two main objectives: (1) To develop the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use and development; and (2) to utilize the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in medicine and biology.

For nuclear medicine programs, the recommendation provides $22,890,000 in operating expenses, the same as the budget request, because of the effectiveness that these programs have demonstrated. The Committee supports additional funds being allocated to this program from within the total available for this account and directs that no reductions be made to the recommended amount.

The House allowance included funds to initiate a Boron Neutron Capture Therapy Cancer Treatment Center at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, using the Surplus Power Burst Facility located at the laboratory for this purpose. The Committee has recently been advised that the Department can undertake to modify the Power Burst Facility and begin this effort within the budgetary resources requested in its budget proposal. Decommissioning and decontaminating funds contained in other portions of the Department of Energy budget for the Power Burst Facility should be transferred to this activity to assist in the modification of the facility. Therefore, the additional funds as provided by the House are not necessary. The Committee supports this action and the proposed work program.

The Committee recommendation includes $7,500,000 to continue construction of project 87–R–130, the Institute of Nuclear Medicine of the Center for Molecular Medicine and Immunology at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey. It is the intention of the Committee that this appropriation will foster basic and clinical research programs that will enable the Center for Molecular Medicine and Immunology in collaboration with the University of Medicine and Dentistry to develop novel approaches for the improved detection and treatment of cancer. The Committee understands that the Center for Molecular Medicine and Immunology and the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey are working to develop a joint venture agreement to define this collaboration. No operating funds are provided for this facility.

For project 88–R–123, Medical University of South Carolina Cancer Research Center, the Committee recommendation provides for an increase of $8,000,000 above the budget request for construction, equipment, and related costs of the Medical University of South Carolina's Cancer Research Center. The cancer research center will utilize new and evolving energy source technologies and function as a model of energy efficient design. This model cancer research center will carry on cancer research activities based on research in nuclear medicine, radiation therapy, and gene mapping. It is the Committee's understanding that substantial non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project, and that no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

Project 88–R–124, the Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for a cost-shared science building at the Oregon Health Science University, Portland, OR. The addition to the basic science building will accelerate efforts to develop a comprehensive program in human genetics and will greatly enhance activities in basic cancer research. These activities will support ongoing research and expansion of basic research in molecular biology, cell biology and anatomy, radiation biology and other areas at the university. It is the Committee's understanding that substantial non-Federal contributions will be committed to the project and no continuing operating funds will be requested or required to support the facility.

The recommendation would provide $345,600,000 for the Magnetic Fusion Energy Research Program. This amount is the same as the budget request and $16,000,000 less than the House allowance.

The goal of this program is to establish the scientific and technological base required for achieving magnetic fusion energy. The program is being conducted according to the Magnetic Fusion Program plan [MFPP], which was developed in 1985. In this plan, the target for completion of magnetic fusion development is determined by the present technical, economic, and political uncertainties of energy supply. Given time scales for the resolution of these uncertainties, it follows that the scientific and technological base for fusion should be essentially available by the turn of the century.

The strategy for providing the scientific and technological base is twofold: (1) maintenance of a strong, domestic R&D program to adequately cover the necessary range of fusion science and technology used, and (2) use of international collaboration to advance the program in a timely way.

Impressive progress continues in establishing the scientific feasibility of magnetic fusion energy. Because of uncertainties in the long-term energy supply, it is important to maintain steady progress toward the realization of fusion energy. The Committee has, therefore, long been supportive of the fusion program and believes it is important for the Government to support the program through the present research phase until a definitive engineering and economic assessment can be performed.

Furthermore, fusion research has resulted in significant advances in other areas of technology and scientific research such as: superconducting magnets; numerical analysis techniques; high heat flux and radiation resistance materials; instrumentation and diagnostic development and high power RF systems. It has also made outstanding contributions to the education of a generation of scientists and engineers with theoretical and experimental skills that are invaluable to the Nation for fusion and other high technology research.

The budget request includes $8,000,000 to initiate the Compact Ignition Tokamak [CIT], a facility currently estimated to cost over $350,000,000. This experiment is intended to bridge a gap in the program between the operation of TFTR at Princeton and the international engineering test reactor [ETR]. Appropriations for construction would be requested over a period of 6 years. Progress in the tokamak program is reflected in the proposal to proceed with the CIT in the upcoming fiscal year. Unfortunately, support for this device and for operation of the TFTR at Princeton is putting a tight squeeze on other activities under investigation by the Magnetic Confinement Program. This squeeze also severely limits the initiation of innovative small experiments that could make important contributions to the advancement of fusion.

At the same time, the Committee is faced with severe budgetary constraints and reduced allocations as part of the deficit reduction effort. These are expected to worsen over the next few years. Initiating the CIT project now will require additional resources in the program.

Therefore, because the Committee is unable to add funding to the fusion program, the Committee recommends that the CIT should be delayed. Starting this project implies a commitment to provide additional funds in subsequent years which the Committee is unable to make at this time.

The Committee recommendation provides that the funds deleted from the CIT construction project, $8,000,000, be added to the confinement systems operating expenses for a total appropriation of $178,920,000 to expedite research on existing devices in support of the CIT concept.

The Committee also supports the Department's continuing efforts in alternate concepts such as the ATF, ZT–H, and OHTE.

The Committee's recommendation includes the budget funds for the United States to participate with the European Community, Japan, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to initiate the design for an engineering test reactor [ETR].

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The budget request proposes $560,975,000 for supporting research and technical analysis including basic energy sciences. The Committee provides $608,675,000 for these activities, an increase of $47,700,000 over the budget request and $41,130,000 below the House.

Basic energy sciences.—A total of $526,775,000 is recommended for these activities, an increase of $47,700,000 above the budget request and $29,630,000 below the House.

Materials science.—The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $4,000,000 for the creation of a national research program in ceramic superconducting technology. The Committee also supports the continued research and development of a 7-GeV Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory which is scheduled for a construction start next year. This advanced facility will be a crucial tool in maintaining U.S. international competitiveness in industrial research, basic research, defense-related research, and in a wide variety of applications including medical diagnosis.

The Committee also supports $3,000,000 included in the budget request for the Advanced Neutron Source at Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The Committee recommends an additional $3,500,000 for the development of expanded projects and programs in materials processing. Materials processing research is an important part of the basic science mission and should be expanded to include a research program on the processing potential of newly discovered materials.

Chemical science.—The Committee allowance includes $3,500,000 for the refurbishment of the High Flux Isotope Reactor at Oak Ridge Na-

tional Laboratory and an additional $2,000,000 to continue the research and development leading to an Advanced Neutron Source at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The Committee supports the restart of the High Flux Isotope Reactor as soon as practicable and will promptly entertain a reprogramming or other funding proposal to get the reactor operations resumed.

The House allowance included $3,000,000 to support the development of particle accelerators at the Texas Accelerator Center. The Committee supports this effort, but it should be funded under the General Science and Research Program where particle accelerator research is conducted.

Energy biosciences.—The Committee has provided $1,200,000 to continue the industrial biotechnology research program at the Oregon Graduate Center and $500,000 to initiate a research effort in membrane-based technologies at the center.

Cooperative and other programs.—The Committee agrees with the House Committee comments concerning the cooperative effort between the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez Educational Foundation, and Jackson State University. This effort to enhance computer science and scientific research at all three institutions began in 1981 and funds have been appropriated annually to support the program. The Committee has included $2,000,000 to maintain and support the program in fiscal year 1988

From within funds available in the Basic Energy Sciences Program, and not otherwise discussed in this report, $11,740,000 is to be made available to continue the ongoing program at the Florida State University computer center.

The House allowance included $3,000,000 to be used for actual research in dosimetry of tumor reactive immunoconjugates and monoclonal antibody imaging treatment methods with the use of positrons. This work is done in the Biological and Environmental Research Program and should be included in that research area instead of Basic Energy Sciences.

Facilities.—The Committee allowance provides for the continued funding of project 84–ER–115, National Center for Chemical Research and project 87–R–411, Center for Science and Engineering at Arizona State University. Both projects were initiated in prior fiscal years and this allowance provides for the continuation of construction. In the case of the National Center for Chemical Research, the $4,000,000 provided in fiscal year 1988 will complete the Federal funding for the project.

Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices, Louisiana State University.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 for the Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices, Louisiana State University. The purpose of the center is the fundamental study of processing and analysis technology, including x-ray lithography, important to microstructure fabrication and electronic device development. The development of advanced materials, and of novel technology for processing these materials is fundamental to the competitiveness of the

United States in the international microelectronics marketplace. A compact electron storage ring for synchrotron radiation research in the soft x-ray region will be incorporated in the center. The center will be a comprehensive, multidisciplinary facility spanning the Colleges of Basic Sciences and Engineering.

Center for Applied Optics, University of Alabama in Huntsville.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 which constitutes the Federal share of the Center for Applied Optics, University of Alabama in Huntsville. The center has as its primary goal the advancement of applied optics. The facility will house the components of the existing university Center of Applied Optics and provide expanded laboratory and service capabilities in support of its mission. The Federal contribution will be used for construction of the facility and the fixed equipment costs of the center. The Committee understands that the university will provide funds for the remainder of the facility, as well as the funds necessary to operate it. The center will provide necessary educational and training opportunities in a broad spectrum of optics disciplines to help in meeting the Nation's widespread demands for optics technology and its applications.

University research support.—The Committee continues to be concerned over the use of highly enriched uranium at university research reactors. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a rule for converting these reactors to low-enriched uranium [LEU]. The Committee is aware that a number of universities have converted or plan to convert to LEU. To further encourage these efforts, the Committee provides $1,900,000 for LEU fuel assistance to universities.

The Committee provides $1,900,000 for LEU fuel fabrication and conversion activities in order to maintain the November 1986 conversion schedule. No funds are provided for HEU-related activities except that adequate funds in this account, not to exceed $700,000, are available for two university reactors which may require HEU fuel.

Multiprogram facilities.—The recommendation includes $56,600,000 for multiprogram lab facilities support, the same as the budget request and the current level.

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendation by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR ENERGY				
I. Solar applications				
A. Solar building energy systems				
Operating expenses	5,928,000	5,250,000	5,850,000	5,250,000
Capital equipment	---	150,000	150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Solar building energy systems	5,928,000	5,400,000	6,000,000	5,400,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses	39,371,000	20,100,000	34,700,000	38,700,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	40,371,000	20,400,000	35,000,000	39,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses	22,860,000	14,000,000	16,950,000	17,950,000
Capital equipment	---	88,000	88,000	88,000
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	22,860,000	14,088,000	17,038,000	18,038,000
D. Biofuels energy systems				
Operating expenses	23,450,000	10,655,000	17,055,000	20,555,000
Capital equipment	600,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Biofuels energy systems	24,050,000	10,655,000	17,055,000	20,555,000
E. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	11,986,000	8,140,000	9,140,000	8,140,000
Capital equipment	170,000	400,000	400,000	400,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
Mod 5-B	4,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	16,656,000	8,540,000	9,540,000	8,540,000
F. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	4,474,000	3,000,000	6,500,000	4,000,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	114,339,000	62,083,000	91,133,000	95,533,000
II. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - OE	750,000	523,000	523,000	1,000,000
B. Solar technology transfer				
Operating expenses	2,450,000	2,090,000	3,090,000	2,090,000
Capital equipment	50,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Solar technology transfer	2,500,000	2,090,000	3,090,000	2,090,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Solar Energy Research Institute				
Capital equipment	315,000	380,000	380,000	380,000
Construction:				
General plant projects	230,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
Subtotal, Solar Energy Research Institute	545,000	620,000	620,000	620,000
D. Resource assessment				
Operating expenses	600,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Capital equipment	---	28,000	28,000	28,000
Subtotal, Resource assessment	600,000	728,000	728,000	728,000
E. Program support - OE	698,000	937,000	937,000	937,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Program direction - OE	4,100,000	4,194,000	4,194,000	4,194,000
Subtotal, Other solar energy	9,193,000	9,092,000	10,092,000	9,569,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY	123,532,000	71,175,000	101,225,000	105,102,000
(Operating expenses)	(116,667,000)	(69,589,000)	(99,639,000)	(103,516,000)
(Capital equipment)	(2,135,000)	(1,346,000)	(1,346,000)	(1,346,000)
(Construction)	(4,730,000)	(240,000)	(240,000)	(240,000)
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Hydrothermal industrialization				
Operating expenses	1,980,000	---	---	1,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Geopressured resources				
Operating expenses	3,970,000	2,700,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
III. Geothermal technology development				
Operating expenses	14,100,000	12,400,000	18,800,000	14,600,000
IV. Program direction - OE	780,000	835,000	835,000	835,000
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	20,830,000	15,935,000	24,635,000	21,435,000
(Operating expenses)	(20,830,000)	(15,935,000)	(24,635,000)	(21,435,000)
HYDROPOWER				
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE	405,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Program direction - OE.....	45,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER.....	450,000	---	---	---
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects research				
Operating expenses.....	2,557,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
B. Reliability research				
Operating expenses.....	2,000,000	1,817,000	1,817,000	1,817,000
C. System technology				
Operating expenses.....	6,369,000	2,150,000	6,920,000	10,920,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction - OE	350,000	333,000	333,000	333,000
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	11,276,000	6,500,000	11,270,000	15,270,000
(Operating expenses)	(11,276,000)	(6,500,000)	(11,270,000)	(15,270,000)
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Battery storage				
Operating expenses	12,237,000	5,269,000	10,269,000	10,269,000
Capital equipment	---	26,000	26,000	26,000
Subtotal, Battery storage	12,237,000	5,295,000	10,295,000	10,295,000
B. Thermal and mechanical storage				
Operating expenses	3,952,000	1,800,000	5,800,000	1,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Program direction - OE.....	400,000	405,000	405,000	405,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems.....	16,589,000	7,500,000	16,500,000	12,500,000
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE.....	27,865,000	14,000,000	27,770,000	27,770,000
(Operating expenses).....	(27,865,000)	(13,974,000)	(27,744,000)	(27,744,000)
(Capital equipment).....	---	(26,000)	(26,000)	(26,000)
NUCLEAR				
I. Nuclear Energy R&D				
A. Light water reactor				
Operating expense.....	33,976,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	32,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Advanced reactor R & D				
Operating expense	72,968,000	67,170,000	93,070,000	93,070,000
Capital equipment	2,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Subtotal, Advanced reactor R & D	75,468,000	70,670,000	96,570,000	96,570,000
C. Space & defense power systems				
Operating expense	38,000,000	70,750,000	54,250,000	52,250,000
Capital equipment	5,280,000	8,850,000	8,850,000	8,850,000
Construction:				
86-N-105 SP-100 fac. mods - HEDL	5,000,000	16,400,000	16,400,000	16,400,000
Subtotal, Space & defense power systems	48,280,000	96,000,000	79,500,000	77,500,000
D. Advanced nuclear systems				
Operating expense	17,600,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	20,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	3,000,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	20,600,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
E. Facilities				
Operating expense	121,200,000	91,200,000	107,900,000	107,900,000
Capital equipment	2,800,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Construction:				
88-N-102 GPP	1,000,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
88-N-101 Mods to reactors	2,200,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
85-N-602 ANAL, INEL, ID, security upgrades	600,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, construction	3,800,000	8,300,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
Subtotal, Facilities	127,800,000	103,000,000	119,700,000	119,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Water cooled breeder				
Operating expense	13,800,000	---	---	---
G. Program direction - OE	7,550,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy R & D	327,474,000	334,170,000	360,270,000	356,270,000
(Operating expense)	(305,094,000)	(292,420,000)	(318,520,000)	(314,520,000)
(Capital equipment)	(13,580,000)	(17,050,000)	(17,050,000)	(17,050,000)
(Construction)	(8,800,000)	(24,700,000)	(24,700,000)	(24,700,000)
II. Remedial actions & Waste technology				
A. Formerly utilized sites remedial action program				
Operating expenses	25,370,000	22,800,000	22,800,000	22,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	25,570,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
B. Grand Junction remedial action OE	800,000	---	---	---
C. Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program				
Operating expenses	113,700,000	115,750,000	115,750,000	113,750,000
Capital equipment	2,300,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Subtotal, Uranium program mill tailings remedial action program	116,000,000	116,000,000	116,000,000	114,000,000
D. Surplus facilities				
Operating expenses	44,000,000	50,700,000	50,700,000	50,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment.....	400,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities.....	44,400,000	51,000,000	51,000,000	51,000,000
E. West Valley				
Operating expenses.....	79,000,000	54,200,000	54,200,000	54,200,000
F. Low level waste				
Operating expenses.....	4,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
G. Waste technology & Byproducts				
Operating expenses.....	5,000,000	---	5,000,000	---
H. Program direction - OE.....	2,100,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Subtotal, Remedial actions & Waste technology....	276,870,000	251,500,000	256,500,000	249,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Civilian waste R&D				
A. Spent Fuel Storage R & D				
Operating expenses	6,300,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
C. Program direction	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Civilian waste R&D	6,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	610,844,000	590,670,000	621,770,000	610,770,000
(Operating expenses)	(585,564,000)	(548,170,000)	(579,270,000)	(568,270,000)
(Capital equipment)	(16,480,000)	(17,800,000)	(17,800,000)	(17,800,000)
(Construction)	(8,800,000)	(24,700,000)	(24,700,000)	(24,700,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
I. Environment, safety and health				
Operating expenses	59,914,000	67,900,000	67,900,000	67,900,000
Capital equipment	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT SAFETY AND HEALTH	62,014,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY				
I. Spill test facility				
Operating expenses	2,000,000	500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH				
I. Biological and Environmental Research				
Operating expenses	175,892,000	201,500,000	208,900,000	201,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Construction:				
88-R-120 General plant projects, various locations	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,000,000
88-R-121 Inst. of human genomic studies	---	---	12,700,000	---
88-R-122 Pediatric research center	---	---	15,000,000	---
88-R-123 Cancer Research Center, Medical University of S.C.	---	---	---	8,000,000
88-R-124 Oregon Health Science University	---	---	---	10,000,000
87-R-130 Inst. of nuc. med., N.J.	3,000,000	---	7,500,000	7,500,000
Subtotal, Construction	6,000,000	3,500,000	38,700,000	28,500,000
Subtotal, Biological and environ. research	190,392,000	213,500,000	256,100,000	238,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Program direction				
Operating expenses.....	3,600,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
TOTAL, BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.....	193,992,000	217,500,000	260,100,000	242,500,000
(Operating expenses).....	(179,492,000)	(205,500,000)	(212,900,000)	(205,500,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(8,500,000)	(8,500,000)	(8,500,000)	(8,500,000)
(Construction).....	(6,000,000)	(3,500,000)	(38,700,000)	(28,500,000)
FUSION				
I. Magnetic fusion				
A. Confinement systems - OE.....	189,300,000	170,920,000	181,920,000	178,920,000
B. Development and technology - OE.....	50,510,000	55,915,000	55,915,000	55,915,000
C. Applied plasma physics - OE.....	70,700,000	73,075,000	73,075,000	73,075,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Planning and projects - OE	4,653,000	4,520,000	4,520,000	4,520,000
E. Program direction - OE	3,940,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
F. Capital Equipment	18,010,000	19,670,000	19,670,000	19,670,000
G. Construction				
88-R-901 General plant projects, various locations	8,200,000	8,900,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
88-R-902 Compact ignition tokamak, Princeton, NJ	---	8,000,000	13,000,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	8,200,000	16,900,000	21,900,000	8,900,000
TOTAL, FUSION	345,313,000	345,600,000	361,600,000	345,600,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses).....	(319,103,000)	(309,030,000)	(320,030,000)	(317,030,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(18,010,000)	(19,670,000)	(19,670,000)	(19,670,000)
(Construction).....	(8,200,000)	(16,900,000)	(21,900,000)	(8,900,000)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Materials sciences - OE.....	154,991,000	169,791,000	195,221,000	177,291,000
B. Chemical sciences - OE.....	115,080,000	124,103,000	137,903,000	129,603,000
C. Applied mathematical sciences - OE.....	38,785,000	40,450,000	40,450,000	42,450,000
D. Engineering and geosciences - OE.....	29,412,000	31,350,000	31,350,000	31,350,000
E. Advanced energy projects - OE.....	12,760,000	14,300,000	14,300,000	14,300,000
F. Energy biosciences - OE.....	16,500,000	18,550,000	18,550,000	20,250,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
G. Program direction - DE.....	4,112,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
H. Capital equipment.....	31,100,000	31,699,000	31,699,000	31,699,000
I. Construction:				
88-R-400 General plant projects, various locations.....	3,150,000	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
88-R-401 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations,.	2,883,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
88-R-403 3 GeV spear injector, SSRL.....	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
88-R-404 Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices, Louisiana State University.....	---	---	---	12,000,000
87-R-403 Neutron Scattering experimental halls, Los Alamos, New Mexico.....	5,000,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-411 Ctr. for Science & Engineering, Arizona State	5,000,000	---	---	10,000,000
87-R-405 Combustion research facility, Phase II, Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California	300,000	---	4,500,000	---
87-R-406 1-2 GeV Synch Rad Sc, LBL	1,500,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
87-R-407 Ctr. for new industrial materials Iowa, State University	6,000,000	---	---	---
88-R-405 Center for Applied Optics, University of Alabama	---	---	10,600,000	5,000,000
88-R-406 Center for Automated Technology, Drexel	---	---	6,500,000	---
88-R-407 Inst. for Advanced Physics, University of Boston	---	---	8,500,000	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-408 Multi-purpose cntr., Boston College	---	---	4,000,000	---
87-R-408 Energy res. complex, University of South Carolina.....	16,300,000	---	---	---
87-R-409 Ctr for nuc imag res-U of Ala.....	12,300,000	---	---	---
87-R-410 St. Christopher's Hospital for Children, Energy demonstration proj.....	14,800,000	---	---	---
86-R-300 Atlanta University.....	7,500,000	---	---	---
85-E-500 Demonstr ctr for info tech-Brown...	5,000,000	---	---	---
85-ER-133 Univ. of Oregon Science Fac., Univ. of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.....	22,900,000	---	---	---
85-ER-403 Kansas State University.....	1,200,000	---	---	---
84-ER-111 NSLS.....	2,600,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-ER-112 Center for advanced material.....	10,560,000	7,632,000	7,632,000	7,632,000
84-ER-113 SSRL enhancement.....	1,717,000	---	---	---
84-ER-115 Nat'l center for chemical research	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	4,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	122,710,000	44,332,000	82,432,000	75,332,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences.....	525,450,000	479,075,000	556,405,000	526,775,000
(Operating expenses).....	(371,640,000)	(403,044,000)	(442,274,000)	(419,744,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(31,100,000)	(31,699,000)	(31,699,000)	(31,699,000)
(Construction).....	(122,710,000)	(44,332,000)	(82,432,000)	(75,332,000)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. & Univ support				
A. Energy research analysis - OE.....	2,000,000	3,700,000	5,200,000	3,700,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. University research support - OE				
1. University reactor fuel assistance.....	3,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
2. University laboratory coop. progra.....	6,075,000	9,100,000	19,100,000	9,100,000
3. Energy manpower assessment progra.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
4. Education and training.....	800,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
5. Visiting scientist progra.....	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
6. Center for excellence in education.....	3,800,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, University research support.....	15,775,000	13,400,000	23,400,000	13,400,000
C. Advisory and oversight - OE.....	2,490,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
D. University research instrumentation.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, & Univ sup	25,265,000	25,300,000	36,800,000	25,300,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Multiprogram Energy Laboratories - Fac. Sup.				
A. Multiprogram general purpose facilities				
88-R-802 Lab building revitalization, BNL....	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
88-R-804 Piping system upgrade, ORNL.....	---	520,000	520,000	520,000
88-R-805 Environmental improvements, BNL.....	---	611,000	611,000	611,000
88-R-806 Environmental health & safety project, LBL.....	---	850,000	850,000	850,000
88-R-807 Electrical system rehab, ANL.....	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
88-R-809 Plant mods to comply with EPA requirements, ANL.....	---	820,000	820,000	820,000
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling fac, LBL...	---	500,000	500,000	500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-R-814 Sewage treatment system upgrade, PNL	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
88-R-817 Upgrade fire protection, ORNL.....	---	800,000	800,000	800,000
87-R-751 Laboratory Restoration I, PNL.....	2,100,000	---	---	---
87-R-752 Piping System Restoration, ORNL.....	725,000	3,075,000	3,075,000	3,075,000
87-R-753 Rehabilitate Laboratory Space (Building 200), ANL.....	1,235,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
87-R-755 Mechanical Systems Rehab., ANL.....	600,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
87-R-756 Waterline Replacement, ANL.....	566,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
87-R-757 Electrical System Rehab., LBL.....	300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
87-R-758 Rehab. Mechanical Utilities, LBL....	915,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-759 Upgrade Steam Dist. System, ORNL....	1,328,000	5,472,000	5,472,000	5,472,000
86-R-726 Fire protection improvements (BNL)..	1,680,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
85-R-701 Central chilled water facility (BNL)	5,700,000	268,000	268,000	268,000
85-R-703 Elect dist system restor (ORNL).....	1,400,000	---	---	---
85-R-702 Replace laboratory roofs (ANL).....	2,392,000	267,000	267,000	267,000
85-R-706 Medical facility (LLNL).....	3,600,000	162,000	162,000	162,000
85-R-707 Hanford site fire alarm sys. upgrade	892,000	617,000	617,000	617,000
85-R-709 Central chilled water plant (ANL)...	3,600,000	638,000	638,000	638,000
85-R-712 Central chilled water system rest...	2,600,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)....	1,807,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, Multi-program facilities.....	31,440,000	30,500,000	30,500,000	30,500,000
B. Environmental compliance				
Operating expenses.....	14,255,000	12,900,000	12,900,000	12,900,000
Capital Equipment.....	1,000,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Construction:				
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade, ORNL.....	---	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
87-R-770 General plant projects (ORNL).....	3,000,000	---	---	---
86-R-801 Nonradiological process waste treat	7,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	10,000,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	12,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Environmental Compliance Progra	25,255,000	26,100,000	26,100,000	26,100,000
Total, Multiprogram Laboratories Facilities Suppo	56,695,000	56,600,000	56,600,000	56,600,000
TOTAL, SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECH. ANALYSIS.....	607,410,000	560,975,000	649,805,000	608,675,000
(Operating expenses).....	(411,160,000)	(441,244,000)	(491,974,000)	(457,944,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(32,100,000)	(32,099,000)	(32,099,000)	(32,099,000)
(Construction).....	(164,150,000)	(87,632,000)	(125,732,000)	(118,632,000)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT				
I. Policy and Management				
A. Policy and management - ER.....	544,000	650,000	650,000	650,000
B. Policy and management - NE.....	1,803,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Policy and management - CE.....	1,527,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
Subtotal, Policy and management.....	3,874,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
ENERGY APPLICATIONS				
I. Technical Information & Management Program				
Operating expenses.....	13,848,000	13,100,000	13,100,000	13,100,000
Capital equipment.....	850,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Support from other programs.....	-4,923,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Technical Information & Management Prog	9,775,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
II. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses.....	1,500,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Construction:				
88-A-601 Modification for energy mgmt.....	9,003,000	13,046,000	13,046,000	13,046,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-A-602 Solid waste fired boiler (LANCL)....	5,868,000	---	---	---
86-A-604 Waste heat recovery (INL).....	---	3,934,000	3,934,000	3,934,000
85-A-602 Fuel storage facility, BNL.....	57,000	---	---	---
85-A-604 Combustion air preheaters.....	72,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	15,000,000	16,980,000	16,980,000	16,980,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management.....	16,500,000	18,880,000	18,880,000	18,880,000
III. Strategic facilities utilization program.....	---	2,175,000	2,175,000	2,175,000
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY APPLICATIONS.....	26,275,000	35,055,000	35,055,000	35,055,000
(Operating expenses).....	(10,425,000)	(17,175,000)	(17,175,000)	(17,175,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Capital equipment).....	(850,000)	(900,000)	(900,000)	(900,000)
(Construction).....	(15,000,000)	(16,980,000)	(16,980,000)	(16,980,000)
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	2,024,399,000	1,925,710,000	2,157,260,000	2,072,207,000
Adjustments:				
Use of prior year balances - (NE) ESRD.....	-5,700,000	-16,000,000	---	-16,000,000
Addback of Cons reduction - (CE) ESRD.....	915,000	---	---	---
Addback of Cons reduction - (NE) ESRD.....	93,000	---	---	---
Addback of Cons reduction - (ESH) ESRD.....	3,000	---	---	---
Addback of Cons reduction - (ER) ESRD.....	379,000	---	---	---
Use of PY balances (from UE).....	-684,158,000	---	-104,000,000	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	1,335,931,000	1,909,710,000	2,053,260,000	2,056,207,000
(Operating expenses).....	(1,048,876,000)	(1,677,317,000)	(1,742,567,000)	(1,775,814,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(80,175,000)	(82,441,000)	(82,441,000)	(82,441,000)
(Construction).....	(206,880,000)	(149,952,000)	(228,252,000)	(197,952,000)

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM COSTS

Appropriations, 1987	$1,210,400,000
Budget estimate, 1988	1,070,000,000
House allowance	1,162,793,000
Committee recommendation	1,116,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+46,000,000
House allowance	−46,793,000

GROSS REVENUES

Appropriations, 1987	−$1,286,400,000
Budget estimate, 1988	
House allowance	−1,301,000,000
Committee recommendation	−1,301,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−1,301,000,000
House allowance	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1987	−$76,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	1,070,000,000
House allowance	−138,207,000
Committee recommendation	−185,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−1,255,000,000
House allowance	−46,793,000

The appropriation recommended for uranium supply and enrichment activities provides for uranium enrichment production, atomic vapor laser isoptope separation [AVLIS] research and development, and related support activities. In this account, revenues received through the sale of enrichment services are used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing these services. The total budget request for fiscal year 1988 is $1,070,000,000. Revenues are estimated in the budget request at $1,301,000,000 which the Department proposes to be deposited directly in the Treasury, and not be used to offset the requested fiscal year 1988 appropriation.

The Committee agrees with the House Committee allowances, recommendations, and views as follows:

Gaseous diffusion operations and support.—The budget request for this activity is $1,064,500,000, of which $1,013,000,000 is for operating expenses and $51,500,000 is for construction activities. The budget proposes the production of approximately 4.2 million separative work units [SWU] in fiscal year 1988, less than 25 percent of the Deparrtment's production capacity. In order to meet projected 1988 sales levels, the Department will draw down its remaining enriched uranium inventory to the minimum level.

The Department's budget request for gaseous diffusion also proposes to start the construction of a new electrical substation and installation of additional process inventory control equipment at the Paducah diffusion plant. The Committee notes that the Department is discussing an agree-

ment with the electricity supplier to the Paducah plant to have the new substation provided by the utility, and encourages such an arrangement. Therefore, the recommended appropriation does not include funds for the substation in expectation of a successful agreement between DOE and the supplier utility. With regard to the process inventory control project, the recommended appropriation reduces the request for this work as the Department has indicated that the schedule for the project could be maintained at a lower initial funding level.

Atomic vapor laser isotope separation.—The Department of Energy budget request contains no funds for continuation of this program in fiscal year 1988, for which $80,000,000 was appropriated in fiscal year 1987, and for which over $500,000,000 has been appropriated since 1973. The Committee believes that abandoning AVLIS research and development at a time when increasing competitive pressures are being experienced by the program is shortsighted and clearly counterproductive to the maintenance of a stable and competitive future program. The Committee directs the Department to get on with the business of conducting a cost-effective AVLIS research, development, and demonstration program to maintain U.S. leadership in this technology and provide the data needed to make an intelligent deployment decision at the earliest reasonable date. The Committee recommendation includes $90,000,000 for this purpose in fiscal year 1988. Of this amount, $74,000,000 is provided for operating expenses, $9,000,000 for capital equipment, and $7,000,000 for construction activities. The Committee understands that the AVLIS Program has obligational authoirty available from prior years which, when combined with the recommended appropriation, will permit an fiscal year 1988 level of activity of approximately $100,000,000. The Department shall submit a detailed multiyear program plan for AVLIS research, development and demonstration in conjunction with its fiscal year 1989 budget submission to Congress.

Privatization.—During the past year, the Department has again continued to pursue attempts to privatize portions of the enterprise or otherwise restructure the enrichment program with no apparent success. The Committee is concerned that the Department continues to procrastinate on the orderly disposition of the gas centrifuge enrichment plant [GCEP]. The Committee urges the Department to come to closure on this matter expeditiously so as to minimize the expenditure of GCEP termination funds. The Committee reiterates its belief that any proposal on the part of the Department to transfer the GCEP facility or any other enrichment facility to the private sector for the purpose of providing enrichment services requires the prior enactment of enabling legislation. The Committee is also recommending language in the bill addressing this issue.

Revenues.—In the Fiscal Year 1987 Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, Congress reserved to itself the authority to determine the level of any unrecouped costs that must be returned to the Treasury in future legislation. To date, the Congress has not made such

a determination. Accordingly, the recommended appropriation does not approve the proposed repayment and employs appropriation language which applies estimated fiscal year 1988 revenues to offset the recommended appropriations. Any revenues collected in fiscal year 1988 in excess of the amount needed to fully offset appropriations shall remain in the "Uranium enrichment" account until transferred or otherwise redirected in legislation. The Department is not to take any action to reduce expenditures associated with this appropriation in an effort to maximize or increase the amount of excess fiscal year 1988 revenues.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendation by program:

General Science and Research Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1987	$578,142,000
Budget estimate, 1988	627,423,000
House allowance	627,423,000
Committee recommendation	637,423,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+10,000,000
House allowance	+10,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1987	$141,375,000
Budget estimate, 1988	187,075,000
House allowance	178,575,000
Committee recommendation	187,075,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+8,500,000

The General Science Program is organized into interrelated scientific programs, high energy physics and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization.

The Committee recommends $824,498,000 for general science and research activities, which is $18,500,000 over the House allowance, and $104,981,000 over the current level of funding.

High energy physics.—The Committee recommends $566,598,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $66,919,000 over the budget level for fiscal year 1987 and $10,000,000 more than the House allowance.

The administration's request for the Superconducting Super Collider [SSC] is for $35,000,000, of which $10,000,000 is for long-lead construction items and related activities. The administration's request for the SSC underscores the Nation's commitment to scientific excellence and to retaining and enhancing its position of world leadership in the field of high energy physics.

The Committee provides $35,000,000 within operating expenses for the SSC in fiscal year 1988. This includes funds to continue the SSC R&D program, support site selection studies, and undertake other necessary activities in support of the project. This will keep the design team together and support other nonsite activities for 1 more year while the administration explores means of funding this project. No funds are provided under the construction item.

The Committee also encourages the Department to explore possible collaboration and/or constructions with potential international participants.

The Secretary of the Department of Energy shall commission two independent financial firms to: (1) analyze and evaluate the economic benefits that will accrue from the construction and operation of the

Superconducting Super Collider, and (2) develop general recommendations on a plan that could be implemented by any of the States which are competing for the Superconducting Super Collider to raise or borrow funds to help defray the cost of the project to the Federal Government.

The plan must take into account the variability of the financial condition of each of the States competing for the Superconducting Super Collider and the financial variability within each State. The goal is to prepare a cost-sharing plan that any of the competing States might be able to reasonably be expected to meet.

The plan shall be completed by December 31, 1988. The Secretary of Energy shall submit it to the appropriate committees of Congress at the time of its submission of its fiscal year 1990 budget proposal. At the same time, each of the States competing for the facility shall be provided a copy of the proposal.

Nuclear physics.—The recommendation includes $255,100,000 for nuclear physics activities, an increase of $38,057,000 over the current level.

The Committee recommends an additional appropriation of $10,000,000 for construction of the continuous electron beam accelerator facility [CEBAF]. A total of $43,500,000 is included in the bill to continue construction of this important project.

The following tabulation shows the Committee recommendation for each program and activity:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
URANIUM ENRICHMENT				
I. Uranium enrichment activities				
A. Gaseous diffusion and operations support				
Operating expenses.....	1,002,249,000	1,013,000,000	1,059,793,000	1,013,000,000
Capital equipment.....	1,000,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
88-N-501 345/161 KV substation, Paducah, KY,	---	18,500,000	---	---
88-N-502 Process inventory control system, Pa	---	33,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
87-N-501 General plant projects.....	1,200,000	---	---	---
87-N-502 Cooling tower upgrading Paducah, KY.	6,300,000	---	---	---
84-N-404 Power systems protection impr.....	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase III.....	6,800,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	14,300,000	51,500,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion and operations.....	1,017,549,000	1,064,500,000	1,077,793,000	1,031,000,000
B. Atomic vapor laser isotope separation				
Operating expenses.....	72,500,000	---	74,000,000	74,000,000
Capital equipment.....	---	---	9,000,000	9,000,000
Construction:				
88-N-503 General plant projects.....	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
81-T-502 Demonstration facilities.....	7,500,000	---	6,000,000	6,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	7,500,000	---	7,000,000	7,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Atomic vapor laser isotope separation	80,000,000	---	90,000,000	90,000,000
C. Gas centrifuge program closeout activities				
1. Gas centrifuge process development & demo				
Operating expenses	4,000,000	---	---	---
D. Program direction - OE	4,775,000	5,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities	1,106,324,000	1,070,000,000	1,172,793,000	1,126,000,000
Reserve	104,000,000	---	---	---
Repayment to Treasury (NON-ADD)	---	(231,000,000)	---	---
TOTAL URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	1,210,324,000	1,070,000,000	1,172,793,000	1,126,000,000
Addback of Congressional Reductions	76,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Use of prior year balances	---	---	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
SUBTOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT	1,210,400,000	1,070,000,000	1,162,793,000	1,116,000,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT	1,210,400,000	1,070,000,000	1,162,793,000	1,116,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,187,600,000)	(1,018,500,000)	(1,128,793,000)	(1,082,000,000)
(Capital equipment)	(1,000,000)	---	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)
(Construction)	(21,800,000)	(51,500,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)
II. Offsetting revenues	-1,286,400,000	---	-1,301,000,000	-1,301,000,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT	-76,000,000	1,070,000,000	-138,207,000	-185,000,000

Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund

Appropriations, 1987	$499,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	500,000,000
House allowance	500,000,000
Committee recommendation	360,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−140,000,000
House allowance	−140,000,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 establishes a program for siting and construction of deep geologic repositories and for submission to Congress of a proposal for one or more monitored, retrievable storage facilities. Funds for these activities are provided from the Nuclear Waste Fund, which received payments from electric utilities of 1 mil per kilowatt hour for electricity produced in nuclear powerplants. Expenditures from the Fund may be made only to the extent approved in advance in appropriations acts. The administration has requested $500,000,000 from the Nuclear Waste Fund for fiscal year 1988.

The Committee recommends that $360,000,000 be provided for the Department of Energy's nuclear waste fund in fiscal year 1988. This recommendation is intended to allow the Department to proceed toward construction of a monitored retrievable storage [MRS] facility, to select a single candidate repository site for characterization, and to provide benefits payments with respect to a repository or MRS, according to the provisions of S. 1668, as reported to the Senate on September 1, (Senate Report 100–152, Calendar No. 305).

The Committee believes that it is prudent to redirect the Department's nuclear waste program to construct an MRS and to characterize candidate repository sites sequentially, rather than in parallel as provided for in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. S. 1668 would provide such necessary redirection to permit the Secretary to carry out his responsibilities under the NWPA to dispose of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste while realizing significant budget savings.

The Committee understands that subsection 403(f) of S. 1668, requiring the Secretary of Energy to study the need for and feasibility of one or more additional monitored retrievable storage [MRS] facilities, is intended to produce a study of the need for a regional MRS to, among other things, facilitate the cleanup of defense high-level radioactive waste in the Western United States.

The Committee's recommendation of $360,000,000 in fiscal year 1988 assumes that legislation containing the essential elements of S. 1668 will be enacted. If, in the alternative, Congress decides to continue along the current course and characterize three candidate repository sites in parallel, significant additional resources will be required to carry out that program in fiscal year 1988.

The support service contractors at existing repository sites should be retained to ensure the DOE capability in management, quality assurance, cost, and schedule systems to provide a cost effective, quality controlled, and safe phase down of the existing sites when a single repository site is selected.

Nonsite-specific work in areas of quality assurance, project management, and other generic areas should be retained to eliminate duplication when final site selection is complete.

Atomic Energy Defense Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1987	$6,013,342,000
Budget estimate, 1988	6,408,165,000
House allowance	6,291,065,000
Committee recommendation	6,251,065,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−157,100,000
House allowance	−40,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1987	$1,468,510,000
Budget estimate, 1988	1,641,835,000
House allowance	1,522,219,000
Committee recommendation	1,498,299,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−143,536,000
House allowance	−23,920,000

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $7,749,364,000 for atomic energy defense activities.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense waste management and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $993,401,000 for research and development activities, an increase of $87,524,000 over the 1987 level and $3,310,000 below the budget request.

The Committee recommendation for general plant construction projects and capital equipment procurements have been reduced by $15,310,000 due to budget constraints. A slight increase has been made to the core R&D program to maintain the fiscal year 1987 level of activity.

Testing.—The Committee recommendation for testing activities totals $473,458,000 which reflects an increase of $2,125,000 compared to fiscal year 1987 and a decrease of $6,250,000 from the budget request, reflecting a reduction in capital equipment procurements and general plant projects. The Committee recommendation for testing includes the budget request for the Marshall Islands Environmental Program. The Committee believes that providing this assistance is important to the health care for the people of Ronetap and Utrik.

Production and surveillance.—The Committee recommendation for production and surveillance totals $2,258,460,000 which reflects an increase of $11,552,000 compared to fiscal year 1987 and a decrease of $99,476,000 from the budget request. The reduction reflects decreases for facilities construction and operating expenses associated with SRAM II warhead production and reductions to general plant construction, capital equipment procurements, and to facilities capability assurance initiatives.

Program direction.—Program direction is funded at $74,826,000 or the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes funds to study the community assistance requirements for Los Alamos County, NM. The Department should analyze the situation and report to the Committee on whether a one-time buy out of this program with Los Alamos might be appropriate and what conditions, if any, for such a buy out would be acceptable to the Department and to the county.

The Committee directs the Secretary to implement without delay the transfer of the Los Alamos Fire Department from the Department of Energy to the incorporated county of Los Alamos, NM, including the recommended upgrading of equipment, as outlined in the June 1987 report prepared pursuant to DOE Contract No. DE-AC32-80AL13159, Modification No. A061.

Nuclear directed energy weapons.—The Committee recommendation for nuclear directed energy weapons is $309,000,000 which is a decrease of $8,000,000 from fiscal year 1987 and a decrease of $171,600,000 from the budget request.

The Committee recognizes that Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] research originated within the Department's basic weapons research and development [R&D] program prior to the President's 1983 budget speech and that the basic R&D and SDI research activities are closely related and mutually supportive of the nuclear weapons program. The Committee also recognizes the need to maintain this basic R&D program as essential to the Nation's nuclear deterrent. Therefore, the Committee believes it is appropriate to limit the resources for the Department's SDI research to assure that the appropriate balance and priority of nuclear deterrence are addressed.

The Committee is concerned that proposed fiscal controls may impact the Department's management and prevent the most cost-effective balance between basic R&D and SDI research activities. To accomplish both program priority and cost-effective management, the Committee believes the Department of Energy [DOE] should have the flexibility to provide for maximum balance among all its R&D activities.

With the understanding that nuclear directed energy technologies may be critical to both a balanced assessment of SDI and the maintenance of an adequate technology base in nuclear weapons research, the Committee provides these funds to support a broad program of research in nuclear directed energy concepts at the DOE weapons laboratories.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
I. High energy physics				
A. Physics research.....	109,400,000	116,698,000	116,698,000	116,698,000
B. Facility operations				
Operating expenses.....	208,379,000	233,300,000	233,300,000	233,300,000
Capital equipment.....	66,357,000	72,800,000	72,800,000	72,800,000
Construction:				
88-R-101 AIP, various locations.....	10,400,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
88-R-103 Superconducting super collider SSC.	---	10,000,000	---	---
GP-E-103 General plant projects.....	10,100,000	10,700,000	10,700,000	10,700,000
86-R-104 Central Computer Fac. (FERMILAB)...	7,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-R-105 AGS Accum/Booster	2,500,000	8,300,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
84-ER-133 SLAC linear collider (SLC)	976,000	---	---	---
81-E-218 Tevatron I	367,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	31,343,000	51,200,000	41,200,000	41,200,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	306,079,000	357,300,000	347,300,000	347,300,000
C. High energy technology	80,500,000	88,700,000	88,700,000	98,700,000
D. Other capital equipment - CE	3,700,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
Subtotal, High energy physics	499,679,000	566,598,000	556,598,000	566,598,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Nuclear physics				
A. Medium energy physics	80,975,000	83,950,000	83,950,000	83,950,000
B. Heavy ion physics	60,675,000	65,280,000	65,280,000	65,280,000
C. Low energy nuclear physics	25,418,000	26,195,000	26,195,000	26,195,000
D. Nuclear theory	10,000,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
E. Capital equipment	14,705,000	16,375,000	16,375,000	16,375,000
F. Construction:				
88-R-201 AIP, various locations	4,100,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations	3,800,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-R-203 Continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, Virginia.....	16,200,000	33,500,000	35,000,000	43,500,000
Subtotal Construction.....	24,100,000	41,500,000	43,000,000	51,500,000
G. Other capital equipment - CE.....	1,170,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics.....	217,043,000	245,100,000	246,600,000	255,100,000
III. General Science program direction - OE.....	2,453,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH.....	719,175,000	814,498,000	805,998,000	824,498,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustments:				
Addback of Cons. reductions - (ER)GS.....	342,000	---	---	---
Total, Adjustments.....	342,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH.....	719,517,000	814,498,000	805,998,000	824,498,000
(Operating expenses).....	(578,142,000)	(627,423,000)	(627,423,000)	(637,423,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(85,932,000)	(94,375,000)	(94,375,000)	(94,375,000)
(Construction).....	(55,443,000)	(92,700,000)	(84,200,000)	(92,700,000)

Inertial confinement fusion.—The Committee recommendation for inertial confinement fusion [ICF] is $155,000,000 which includes a recommendation of $149,000,000 for operating expenses and $6,000,000 for capital equipment.

No funds are provided for the University of Rochester's Laboratory for Laser Energetics for the design, engineering, and development for the upgrade of the Omega laser.

The Committee believes the ICF Program offers promise and should be operated at a much higher funding level than gets proposed by the administration. The investment made in ICF facilities is large. The operating level proposed by the administration would not utilize these facilities in a manner consistent with the justification for their development. The allocation of operating funds is as follows:

Glass laser program	$91,000,000
Gas laser program	30,000,000
Pulsed power experiment	28,000,000
Total	149,000,000

Within the glass program $68,300,000 is provided for the program at LLNL, $14,300,000 for the program at KMSF, and $8,400,000 for the program at the University of Rochester. Funding for the NRL should not be less than $2,500,000 for activities within the glass laser program.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The Materials Production Program primarily provides the special nuclear materials used in the development, testing, and production of nuclear weapons. The Committee recommends funds to allow the Department to continue to operate necessary production reactors, processing facilities, and support facilities. These facilities include a reactor feed material production complex, production reactors at Savannah River and Richland, spent fuel chemical processing plants at Savannah River, Richland, and Idaho, and support facilities.

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $1,817,887,000 which is $32,925,000 below the current level and $15,000,000 below the House allowance.

The Materials Production Program is organized into the following subcategories: Reactor operations, processing of nuclear materials, supporting services, enriched material, capital equipment, and program direction.

Reactor operations.—The Committee recommendation for reactor operations totals $590,635,000 which reflects a decrease of $21,459,000 compared to fiscal year 1987 and a decrease of $11,000,000 from the budget request.

The Committee notes with concern the recent developments at the defense reactors which produce special nuclear materials for the nuclear weapons stockpile. Taken together, these developments will make it more difficult to support our nuclear weapons projections. The Committee is particularly concerned over the N-Reactor at Hanford because it is shutdown as a result of independent safety reviews for the in-

stallation of various improvements. Due to the reactor's very limited remaining life, the adequacy and cost of needed safety and environmental repairs and the potential effect of pending litigation, there is serious doubt about the future operation of the reactor. The remaining three reactors at Savannah River are currently operating at reduced power levels as a result of questions concerning the emergency core cooling system. Under the most optimistic of scenarios, the continued adequacy of these reactors, all of which are over 20 years old, to meet our nuclear materials needs is uncertain.

At the same time, budgetary pressure on the Department has increased in recent years due to the additional requirements for activities to protect the public health and safety, to meet environmental standards, and to enhance the security of the nuclear weapons complex. Primarily due to increasing budget constraints, the Department has not acted on numerous options which are available to meet future material requirements. One of the most important of these options, a program to provide for replacement reactors, has been deferred repeatedly over the last few years.

In view of the current situation, the Committee believes that reactor operations at the Hanford reactor, which may be curtailed by safety, environmental, or legal considerations in any event must be halted indefinitely in order to make funds available to meet future needs. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to place the N-Reactor in a cold standby status that would minimize further expenditure of funds for both modifications and operation of the reactor, while preserving the option to start operation with a lead time of not less than 2 to 3 years. This approach would fully maintain our dual production capability for plutonium in case of national emergency or clear national need while providing funds for other materials activities. The Department shall retain a minimum force of certified operations personnel at Hanford. Simulator capability and plant documentation should be maintained during the shutdown. The existing finished fuel inventory and a slightly reduced security force should be retained.

In concert with the reactor shutdown, the Committee directs the Department to provide to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations a complete review and analysis on the need for and cost effectiveness of improvements to the reactor which will be required to maintain the reactors capability consistent with its standby status.

The Committee recommendation includes $25,000,000 for initiation of construction of new production reactors; $10,000,000 of these funds are added as operating funds for planning and design.

The Committee is concerned that the production capability of the existing reactors at Savannah River and Hanford can adequately meet national defense requirements. Action to replace these reactors in an orderly manner is an urgent national defense requirement.

The Committee fears that our Nation's future material needs will not be met if only one new production reactor is planned for, designed and built to replace all the aging reactors in the Department of Energy's

materials production complex. Therefore, the Committee looks with favor upon a two-reactor approach, which would include planning for, designing, and constructing two production reactors. The Committee believes the Department should consider the relative merits of at least two technological approaches and available sites.

Although the Department of Energy has not yet submitted formal schedule or cost estimates for replacement production reactors, the Committee understands that those matters are being addressed and will be submitted in time for consideration by the Congress in connection with the fiscal year 1989 budget request. To insure this, the Committee concurs with the Senate Armed Services Committee's requirement for a comprehensive study and report by the Secretary of Energy not later than February 1, 1988.

The Committee believes that a dual effort will minimize technical and regulatory risks that could delay the deployment of a new production reactor. Also, the competitive aspect of a dual technology approach should tend to reduce costs. In addition, continuing the existing scheme, where production reactors are located at widely separated geographic sites, would reduce the risks of loss of production capacity from natural disaster, sabotage, and other site-related risks.

Processing of nuclear materials.—The Committee recommendation for processing of nuclear materials total $531,775,000 which reflects an increase of $40,000,000 to the budget request.

The recommended funding for operating expenses is $475,700,000 which includes $70,000,000 for special isotope separation or an increase of $20,000,000 to the budget request for this activity. The recommended funding for construction is $56,075,000 which includes $25,000,000 for construction of the special isotope separation facility.

Supporting services.—The Committee recommendation for supporting services totals $427,153,000 which reflects an increase of $34,064,000 compared to fiscal year 1987 and a decrease of $24,100,000 from the budget request. The reduction reflects decreases in general plant projects, productivity retention projects, and restoration of productivity capability projects that should be delayed to future years due to budget constraints.

Enriched material.—The Committee recommendation for enriched materials is $153,000,000 which represents a $40,000,000 decrease from the budget request. The recommendation reflects a reduction in the purchase of highly enriched uranium used in naval reactor plants by $37,000,000 and a reduction in enrichment services for other defense needs by $3,000,000 as a result of reactor shutdowns.

Capital equipment and program direction.—The Committee recommendation is $91,285,000 for capital equipment which is $10,000,000 below the budget request. Due to budgetary constraints, equipment procurements should be delayed until future fiscal years. The Committee recommendation for program direction is $24,039,000.

The Committee recommends that $700,000 be made available for the purchase of laboratory equipment for a new science building to be

located on the campus of the University of South Carolina-Aiken. USC-Aiken has undertaken a vigorous program at both the precollege and college levels to develop a scientific and technology curriculum for educating and training potential employees for the Savannah River project. As a result of the high rate of employee retirement that has been projected for the Savannah River project over the next several years, the Committee feels that the efforts underway at USC-Aiken will be very beneficial in satisfying the long-term interests of the Department of Energy in that region. In this regard, the Department is directed to provide $700,000 from funds made available to Savannah River to USC-Aiken for the purchase of laboratory equipment to be used for those scientific and technology programs directed at developing employees for the Savannah River project and/or other DOE projects.

DEFENSE WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

The Defense Waste and Environmental Restoration Program includes near-term and longer term activities to assure that existing and future nuclear waste from Federal Government program activities can be isolated from the biosphere and pose no significant threat to public health and safety. For the near term, the wastes are managed through interim storage facilities. Simultaneous efforts are proceeding on development of technology and processes for long-term disposal.

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $851,132,000 for defense nuclear waste and environmental restoration activities, $5,200,000 below the budget request and $40,000,000 below the House allowance. No specific allocation, ceilings, or floors are recommended by the Committee at this time. The proposed authorization does not include any such allocation and the Committee believes that to do so now only serves to penalize other waste sites and activities if provided without added funding.

Project 81–T–105, defense waste processing facility at Savannah River, the Committee agrees with the requested level in the budget and provides $120,000,000 for the project. This will provide for the continued construction of critical portions of the project.

The Committee recommends $1,000,000 to support the Pacific Northwest Hazardous Waste Center to be established at the Pacific Northwest Laboratory in accordance with the authorization contained in Public Law 99–499, section 118(o).

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Naval Reactors Development Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships.

The Committee recommendation includes $605,800,000 for the Naval Reactor Development Program which reflects a reduction of $6,200,000.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

This program provides for the research, development, testing, and support activities related to the detection of nuclear test activities in response to treaty verification and national security requirements; analysis and support for nuclear intelligence, export control and arms control issues; and the review of export licenses applications as required by the Atomic Energy Act as amended, the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, and the Export Administration Act of 1979.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology provides $100,600,000, the same as the budget request and $10,000,000 less than the House allowance. This is also the same as the proposed authorization.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $77,800,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development within this program, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The recommendation includes $32,000,000 for security investigations, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates, the budget request, and House allowance are shown in the following table:

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
I. WEAPONS ACTIVITIES				
A. Research and development				
1. Core program				
a. Operating expenses	724,375,000	757,019,000	769,019,000	769,019,000
b. Capital equipment	78,080,000	97,930,000	87,020,000	87,020,000
c. Construction:				
88-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	20,964,000	22,200,000	17,800,000	17,800,000
88-D-105 Special nuclear materials R&D lab replacement, LANL	---	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facs revitalization, Phase II, various locations	---	21,962,000	21,962,000	21,962,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-105 Instrumentation systems laboratory, SNL	7,332,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
86-D-106 Lab data communication center, LANL	11,811,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
85-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facs revitalization, Phase I, various locations	39,960,000	33,500,000	33,500,000	33,500,000
84-D-102 Radiation-hardened integrated circuit lab, SNLA	2,953,000	---	---	---
82-D-144 Simulation technology laboratory, SNLA	5,905,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	88,925,000	107,862,000	103,462,000	103,462,000
Subtotal, Core program	891,380,000	962,811,000	959,501,000	959,501,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
2. Environment, safety & health - construction				
88-D-102 Sanitary wastewater systems consolidation, LANL	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
88-D-103 Seismic upgrade, Bldg 111, LLNL	---	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL	5,315,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Future year projects	---	---	---	---
Subtotal, ES&H construction	5,315,000	14,100,000	14,100,000	14,100,000
3. Safeguards & security - construction				
88-D-104 Safeguards and security upgrade Phase II, LANL	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-D-104 Safeguards and security enhancement, phase II, LLNL	1,968,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
85-D-103 Safeguards and security enhancements, LLNL and SNLL	6,791,000	9,200,000	9,200,000	9,200,000
85-D-106 Hardened engineering test bldg, LLNL	423,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Safeguards & security - construction	9,182,000	19,800,000	19,800,000	19,800,000
Subtotal, Research and development	905,877,000	996,711,000	993,401,000	993,401,000
B. Testing				
1. Core program				
a. Operating expenses	402,324,000	396,550,000	396,550,000	396,550,000
b. Capital equipment	41,746,000	41,700,000	37,050,000	37,050,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
c. Construction:				
88-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	7,579,000	8,000,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
84-D-107 Nuclear testing facilities revitalization, various locations	9,842,000	5,458,000	5,458,000	5,458,000
Subtotal, Construction	17,421,000	13,458,000	11,858,000	11,858,000
Subtotal, Core program	461,491,000	451,708,000	445,458,000	445,458,000
2. Safeguards & security - construction				
85-D-105 Combined device assembly fac, NTS, NV	9,842,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000
Subtotal, Safeguards & security - construction	9,842,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Testing	471,333,000	479,708,000	473,458,000	473,458,000
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,377,210,000	1,476,419,000	1,466,859,000	1,466,859,000
C. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses	1,799,136,000	1,896,830,000	1,893,830,000	1,893,830,000
Capital equipment	126,965,000	129,600,000	115,160,000	115,160,000
Construction:				
88-D-121 General plant projects, various locations	29,527,000	33,000,000	26,500,000	26,500,000
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program, various locations	---	19,200,000	15,400,000	15,400,000
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	984,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-D-124 Fire protection upgrade, various locations	---	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
88-D-125 High explosive machining facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
88-D-126 Personnel radiological monitoring labs, various locations	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
88-D-129 Small intercontinental ballistic missile (SICBM) warhead production facs, various locations	---	20,000,000	29,400,000	20,000,000
87-D-122 SRAM II warhead production facility, various locations	984,000	37,016,000	---	---
87-D-123 Protective clothing decon facility, Rocky Flats, Golden, CO	492,000	4,608,000	4,608,000	4,608,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-D-127 ES&H Upgrade, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	2,362,000	1,737,000	1,737,000	1,737,000
87-D-130 Receiving and shipping facility, Pinellas Plant, St. Petersburg, FL	295,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
86-D-122 Structural upgrade of existing plutonium facilities, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	2,559,000	221,000	221,000	221,000
86-D-123 Environmental hazards elimination, various locations	18,011,000	13,289,000	13,289,000	8,086,000
86-D-124 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Phase II, Mound Facility, Miamisburg, OH	2,953,000	---	---	---
86-D-125 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Ph. II, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	6,397,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-130 Tritium loading facility replacement Savannah River, Aiken, SC	29,527,000	46,773,000	46,773,000	43,948,000
85-D-112 Enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	21,456,000	12,544,000	12,544,000	11,263,000
85-D-113 Power plant and steam dist system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	5,512,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	---
85-D-115 Renovate plutonium building utility systems, Rocky Flats, CO	14,271,000	1,060,000	1,060,000	1,060,000
85-D-121 Air and water pollution control facs, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	9,842,000	998,000	998,000	998,000
85-D-125 Tactical bomb production facilities, various locations	13,090,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-112 TRIDENT II warhead production facilities, various locations	12,057,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	1,864,000
84-D-124 Environmental improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	9,842,000	5,878,000	5,878,000	5,878,000
84-D-211 Safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	29,527,000	18,253,000	18,253,000	15,478,000
84-D-212 Safeguards and site security upgrade, Pinellas Plant, FL	984,000	---	---	---
82-D-107 Utilities & equip restoration, replace & upgrade, Phase III, var locations	100,293,000	96,129,000	76,929,000	76,929,000
82-D-109 155mm artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP) prod facs, var locations	9,842,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	320,807,000	331,506,000	274,390,000	249,470,000
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	2,246,908,000	2,357,936,000	2,283,380,000	2,258,460,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction				
Operating expenses				
1. Weapons program	61,788,000	66,848,000	66,848,000	66,848,000
2. Community assistance	7,972,000	7,978,000	7,978,000	7,978,000
Subtotal, Program direction	69,760,000	74,826,000	74,826,000	74,826,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,693,878,000	3,909,181,000	3,825,065,000	3,800,145,000
II. NUCLEAR DIRECTED ENERGY WEAPONS				
a. Operating expenses	270,000,000	416,600,000	240,000,000	260,000,000
b. Capital equipment	32,237,000	42,000,000	17,000,000	27,000,000
c. Construction:				
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facs revitalization, Phase II, (NDER facility at LLNL)	---	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
86-D-104 Strategic defenses facility, SNLA ..	14,763,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	14,763,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
Subtotal, Nuclear directed energy weapons.....	317,000,000	480,600,000	279,000,000	309,000,000
III. INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION				
a. Operating expenses.....	142,713,000	112,500,000	149,000,000	149,000,000
b. Capital equipment.....	8,858,000	6,000,000	10,000,000	6,000,000
Subtotal, Inertial fusion.....	151,571,000	118,500,000	159,000,000	155,000,000
IV. MATERIALS PRODUCTION				
A. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses.....	572,439,000	576,035,000	550,035,000	550,035,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction				
Programmatic projects:				
88-D-133 New Production Reactor.....	---	---	10,000,000	15,000,000
86-D-150 In-core neutron monitoring system N-Reactor, Richland, WA	2,057,000	---	---	---
86-D-152 Reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, SC	4,626,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
85-D-145 Fuel production facility, Savannah River, SC.....	30,019,000	21,100,000	21,100,000	21,100,000
84-D-136 Enriched uranium conversion facility modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	2,953,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, programmatic projects.....	39,655,000	25,600,000	35,600,000	40,600,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations.....	612,094,000	601,635,000	585,635,000	590,635,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses	453,069,000	455,700,000	485,700,000	475,700,000
Construction				
Programmatic projects:				
86-D148 Special isotope separation project, Idaho Falls, ID	24,606,000	5,000,000	35,000,000	25,000,000
86-D-151 PUREX electrical system upgrade, Richland, WA	3,838,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
86-D-153 Additional line III tritium furnace, Savannah River, SC	7,185,000	---	---	---
86-D-157 Hydrofluorination system, FB-Line, Savannah River, SC	2,470,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-135 Process facility modifications, Richland, WA	29,527,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotal, programmatic projects	67,626,000	16,900,000	46,900,000	36,900,000
Environment, safety & health projects:				
86-D-154 Effluent treatment facility, Savannah River, SC	13,435,000	19,175,000	19,175,000	19,175,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects	13,435,000	19,175,000	19,175,000	19,175,000
Subtotal, Construction	81,061,000	36,075,000	66,075,000	56,075,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials	534,130,000	491,775,000	551,775,000	531,775,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Supporting services				
Operating expenses.....	223,059,000	221,747,000	221,747,000	221,747,000
Construction				
Programmatic projects:				
88-D-146 General plant projects, various locations.....	31,476,000	39,030,000	31,230,000	31,230,000
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phase I & II & III, various locations.....	44,512,000	68,860,000	55,160,000	55,160,000
85-D-139 Fuel processing restoration, IFPF, INEL, ID	30,511,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000
85-D-140 Productivity and radiological improvements, FMPC, Fernald, OH	20,669,000	7,831,000	7,831,000	7,831,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-D-124 Restoration of production capabilities, Phase II, III, IV & V, var locs.	3,937,000	13,200,000	10,600,000	10,600,000
Subtotal, programmatic projects.....	131,105,000	156,921,000	132,821,000	132,821,000
Environment, safety & health projects:				
87-D-149 Reduced chemical discharges to process sewers, Richland, WA.....	3,100,000	---	---	---
87-D-150 Radioactive liquid effluent treatment facility, Richland, WA.....	3,937,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
87-D-152 Environmental protection plantwide, Savannah River, SC.....	1,476,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
87-D-159 Environmental, health, and safety improvements, Ph I & II, FMPC, Fernald, Ohio.....	9,842,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC.....	---	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects.....	18,355,000	47,000,000	47,000,000	47,000,000
Safeguards & security projects:				
88-D-153 Additional reactor safeguards, Savannah River, SC.....	---	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
86-D-156 Plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, SC	8,809,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
84-D-134 Safeguards and security improvements Plant-wide, Savannah River, SC	11,466,000	9,685,000	9,685,000	9,685,000
84-D-137 Facility security systems upgrade, IFPF, INEL, ID	295,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, safeguards & security projects.....	20,570,000	25,585,000	25,585,000	25,585,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Subtotal, Construction	170,030,000	229,506,000	205,406,000	205,406,000
Subtotal, Supporting services	393,089,000	451,253,000	427,153,000	427,153,000
D. Enriched material	176,669,000	193,000,000	153,000,000	153,000,000
E. Capital equipment	112,291,000	101,285,000	91,285,000	91,285,000
F. Program direction	22,539,000	24,039,000	24,039,000	24,039,000
Subtotal, Materials production	1,850,812,000	1,862,987,000	1,832,887,000	1,817,887,000
V. DEFENSE WASTE AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION				
A. Environmental Restoration				
Operating expenses	53,760,000	77,798,000	97,798,000	77,798,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Waste operations and projects				
Operating expenses.....	319,774,000	391,597,000	411,597,000	391,597,000
Construction				
Programmatic projects:				
88-D-171 General plant projects,various locations.....	25,132,000	25,636,000	20,436,000	20,436,000
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant, Richland, WA.....	---	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
87-D-173 242-A Evaporator/crystallizer upgrade, Richland, WA.....	2,756,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
87-D-174 241-AQ Tank farm, Richland, WA.....	3,267,000	22,300,000	22,300,000	22,300,000
87-D-175 Steam system rehab, Ph I, RL.....	886,000	12,600,000	12,600,000	12,600,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
87-D-180 Burial ground expansion, Savannah River, SC	4,232,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
87-D-181 Diversion box and pump pit containment buildings, Savannah River, SC	1,339,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
86-D-174 Low-level waste processing and shipping system, FMPC, Fernald, OH	9,842,000	4,628,000	4,628,000	4,628,000
85-D-157 Seventh calcined solids storage facility, INEL, ID	787,000	2,181,000	2,181,000	2,181,000
85-D-159 New waste transfer facilities H-Area, Savannah River, SC	8,071,000	13,682,000	13,682,000	13,682,000
82-N-103 Waste handling & isolation facs, Richland, WA	1,968,000	---	---	---
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC	132,871,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
77-13-F Waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, Southeast, NM.....	---	35,901,000	35,901,000	35,901,000
Prior year projects.....	-5,400,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, programmatic projects.....	185,751,000	266,628,000	261,428,000	261,428,000
Environment, safety & health projects:				
87-D-172 WESF K-3 Filter upgrade, Richland, WA.....	492,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
87-D-177 Test reactor area liquid radioactive waste cleanup, Phase III, INEL, Idaho.....	689,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
86-D-172 B-Plant F-Filter, Richland, WA	2,953,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
85-D-158 Central warehouse upgrade, Richland, WA	5,479,000	56,000	56,000	56,000
Subtotal, ES&H projects	9,613,000	6,756,000	6,756,000	6,756,000
Safeguards & security projects:				
86-D-175 INEL security upgrade, ID	5,216,000	742,000	742,000	742,000
85-D-160 Test reactor area security system upgrade, INEL, ID	2,707,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, safeguards & security projects	7,923,000	742,000	742,000	742,000
Subtotal, Construction	203,287,000	274,126,000	268,926,000	268,926,000
Subtotal, Waste operations and projects	523,061,000	665,723,000	680,523,000	660,523,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Waste research and development	68,110,000	51,082,000	51,082,000	51,082,000
D. Hazardous waste & remedial actions	7,599,000	7,112,000	7,112,000	7,112,000
E. Transportation management	8,517,000	8,400,000	8,400,000	8,400,000
F. Capital equipment	35,350,000	43,687,000	43,687,000	43,687,000
G. Program direction	2,105,000	2,530,000	2,530,000	2,530,000
Subtotal, Defense waste & environmental restoration	698,502,000	856,332,000	891,132,000	851,132,000
VI. NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses	69,880,000	74,000,000	74,000,000	74,000,000
Subtotal, Plant development	69,880,000	74,000,000	74,000,000	74,000,000

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1987	$383,268,000
Budget estimate, 1988	394,156,000
House allowance	392,640,000
Committee recommendation	419,322,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+25,166,000
House allowance	+26,682,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1987	$8,188,000
Budget estimate, 1988	5,873,000
House allowance	5,873,000
Committee recommendation	5,873,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $191,299,000 for departmental administration.

The appropriation recommended for departmental administration supports the Department's general management, administrative, and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for: (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel, and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the Institutional Relations Program that provides information services and outreach activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, evaluation of energy-related inventions and support for energy training and education; (4) the performance of security investigations for persons with access to restricted atomic energy data; (5) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (6) revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related direct costs.

Changes to the budget request recommended by the Committee are as follows: $200,000 to continue the Council of Energy Resource Tribes under Indian affairs; and $500,000 to provide a grant to the Consumer Energy Council of America Research Foundation to establish, organize, and support a National Energy Information Clearinghouse. These funds would support the operations for the first year and thereafter, it would be self-supporting.

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses	264,757,000	249,700,000	249,700,000	249,700,000
Subtotal, Reactor development	264,757,000	249,700,000	249,700,000	249,700,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses	166,335,000	208,000,000	208,000,000	208,000,000
Subtotal, Reactor operation and evaluation	166,335,000	208,000,000	208,000,000	208,000,000
D. Capital equipment	50,885,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
E. Construction				
88-N-101 General plant projects, various locations	4,724,000	6,000,000	4,800,000	4,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
88-N-102 Expended core facility receiving station, Naval Reactors Facility, ID.....	---	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
88-N-103 Material handling and storage modifications, KAPL, Niskayuna, NY.....	---	400,000	400,000	400,000
88-N-104 Prototype availability facilities, Kesselring, KAPL, West Milton, NY.....	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
87-N-102 Kesselring site facilities upgrade, KAPL, West Milton, NY.....	4,921,000	8,400,000	8,400,000	8,400,000
87-N-103 Computation laboratory addition, Bettis, Pittsburgh, PA.....	2,264,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.....	11,909,000	17,900,000	16,700,000	16,700,000
F. Program direction	11,614,000	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,400,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development.....	575,380,000	612,000,000	605,800,000	605,800,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VII. OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS				
A. Verification and control technology				
1. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	92,109,000	95,500,000	105,500,000	95,500,000
Capital equipment	2,680,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
Construction:				
85-D-171 Space science lab., LANL, NM	1,968,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	96,757,000	100,600,000	110,600,000	100,600,000
B. Nuclear safeguards and security				
1. Nuclear safeguards and security				
Operating expenses	59,061,000	73,200,000	73,200,000	73,200,000
Capital equipment	4,269,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
86-D-186 Nuclear safeguards tech. lab, LANL, NM	984,000	---	---	---
Subtotal Nuclear safeguards and security	64,314,000	77,800,000	77,800,000	77,800,000
C. Security investigations - OE	32,675,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Subtotal, Other national security programs	193,746,000	210,400,000	220,400,000	210,400,000
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	7,480,889,000	8,050,000,000	7,813,284,000	7,749,364,000
(Operating expenses)	(6,012,379,000)	(6,408,165,000)	(6,291,065,000)	(6,251,065,000)
(Capital equipment)	(493,361,000)	(521,902,000)	(455,902,000)	(461,902,000)
(Construction)	(975,149,000)	(1,119,933,000)	(1,066,317,000)	(1,036,397,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustments:				
Addback of proposed pub aff/for trav approp trans FY87	963,000	---	---	---
Total, Adjustments	963,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	7,481,852,000	8,050,000,000	7,813,284,000	7,749,364,000
(Operating expenses)	(6,013,342,000)	(6,408,165,000)	(6,291,065,000)	(6,251,065,000)
(Capital equipment)	(493,361,000)	(521,902,000)	(455,902,000)	(461,902,000)
(Construction)	(975,149,000)	(1,119,933,000)	(1,066,317,000)	(1,036,397,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
I. Office of the Secretary - Salaries and expenses				
A. Office of the Secretary	1,259,000	1,274,000	1,274,000	1,274,000
B. Other expenses	655,000	654,000	654,000	654,000
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary	1,914,000	1,928,000	1,928,000	1,928,000
II. General management - salaries				
A. Board of Contract Appeals	368,000	367,000	367,000	367,000
B. General Counsel	7,722,000	7,704,000	7,704,000	7,704,000
C. Inspector General	7,843,000	7,824,000	7,824,000	7,824,000
D. A/S Management & Administration	41,480,000	42,180,000	42,180,000	42,180,000
E. A/S Cong., Intergov. & Public Affairs	4,508,000	4,176,000	4,176,000	4,176,000
F. Operations Offices	60,916,000	60,101,000	60,101,000	60,101,000
G. Policy, Planning & Analysis	2,179,000	2,806,000	2,806,000	2,806,000
H. A/S International Affairs	2,878,000	3,064,000	3,064,000	3,064,000

Power Marketing Administrations

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining Capital Program requirements. All of the other power marketing administrations are funded annually with appropriations and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury.

PRIVATIZATION OF POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

The Urgent Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1986 contains a legislative prohibition that would reserve for Congress the decision on any sale of the power marketing agencies. The solicitation of proposals or the drafting of documents designed to transfer the assets of these agencies out of Federal ownership or control would be prohibited unless approved by Congress.

The provision also preserves for the power marketing administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority their ability to routinely dispose of surplus property or transfer facilities or functions under existing statutes.

This action will preclude the damage to morale of the PMA and TVA employees because of uncertainty as to their future as Federal employees and will enable the power marketing administrations and TVA to make long-range plans without the uncertainty of their future.

The Committee reiterates its support of the provision contained in the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act.

RATE REFORM

The administration has proposed changes in fiscal year 1987 that would provide for a significant increase in the rates charged by the power marketing administrations. The Committee has historically been a strong supporter of fiscal responsibility by the power marketing administrations. The Committee has supported and encouraged the significant progress of Bonneville in bringing costs under control and setting a foundation for rate stability.

The Committee is concerned, however, that proposed rate reform would have significant adverse impact on the economic health of the regions supported by the power marketing administrations and would result in less repayments to the Federal Government because of the loss

of significant energy-intensive industries in the regions. The Committee has included bill language in the past preventing a change from a cost base to market base for PMA rates. This language was intended to prevent a unilateral change in the terms of agreement that were made years ago between the Federal Government and the regions served by the PMA's.

The Committee has been assured that the administration will make no changes in the rate development process administratively. The Committee therefore directs that the rate structure not be modified without the enactment of appropriate legislation.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

Alaska Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1987	$2,881,000
Budget estimate, 1988	3,026,000
House allowance	3,026,000
Committee recommendation	3,026,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	.....
House allowance	.....

An appropriation of $3,026,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request and House allowance.

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and power marketing of two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska. The operating projects are the 30,000 kW Eklutna project near Anchorage and the 47,160 kW Snettisham project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams reservoirs, powerplants, transmissions systems, and necessary maintenance facilities. Power is marketed at wholesale to five Alaskan utilities. The projects represent a current Federal investment of $113,000,000 and a replacement value in excess of $275,000,000.

Bonneville Power Administration Fund

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

Appropriations, 1987	($10,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1988	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	(−10,000,000)
House allowance	.....

Bonneville Power Administration [BPA] is the Federal electric power marketing agency for the Federal Columbia River Power System [FCRPS], which consists of the hydroelectric generating facilities in the Pacific Northwest of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior (30 projects at present), plus BPA's transmission system of more than 14,000 circuit-miles of high-voltage transmission lines and 381 substations. BPA markets about one-half of the electric power produced in the Northwest and provides about four-fifths of the region's bulk electric power transmission capacity. Also, BPA markets and exchanges electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA operates on a self-financing basis, thus requiring no appropriations. However, BPA's fiscal year 1988 budget reflects the need for additional borrowing authority of $185,200,000 to carry out the proposed program and new responsibilities pursuant to Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act.

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
I. Office of Minority Economic Impact.....	521,000	520,000	520,000	520,000
Subtotal, Salaries.....	128,415,000	128,742,000	128,742,000	128,742,000
III. General management - other expenses				
A. Other salary expenses.....	7,107,000	7,145,000	7,145,000	7,145,000
B. Benefits.....	19,752,000	25,714,000	25,714,000	25,714,000
C. Travel.....	5,170,000	5,170,000	5,170,000	5,170,000
D. Services.....	134,573,000	130,340,000	130,340,000	130,340,000
E. Capital equipment.....	8,188,000	5,873,000	5,873,000	5,873,000
Subtotal, Other expenses.....	174,790,000	174,242,000	174,242,000	174,242,000
IV. Program Support				
A. Policy analysis and system studies.....	2,500,000	4,500,000	2,500,000	4,500,000
B. Indian Affairs.....	200,000	---	---	200,000
C. Consumer Affairs.....	50,000	65,000	65,000	565,000
D. Public Affairs.....	206,000	251,000	451,000	251,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Competition	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
F. International Policy Studies	947,000	1,200,000	947,000	947,000
G. Office of Minority Economic Impact	3,178,000	2,663,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
H. Cost of work for others	115,050,000	110,570,000	110,570,000	110,570,000
Subtotal, Program support	122,181,000	119,299,000	117,783,000	120,283,000
V. Miscellaneous revenues	-251,947,000	-233,896,000	-233,896,000	-233,896,000
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	175,353,000	190,315,000	188,799,000	191,299,000
Use of prior year balances	-35,844,000	-24,182,000	-24,182,000	---
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION	139,509,000	166,133,000	164,617,000	191,299,000
(Operating expenses)	(131,321,000)	(160,260,000)	(158,744,000)	(185,426,000)
(Capital equipment)	(8,188,000)	(5,873,000)	(5,873,000)	(5,873,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Alaska Power Administration				
A. Operating expenses	3,281,000	3,191,000	3,191,000	3,191,000
B. Use of prior year balances	-400,000	-165,000	-165,000	-165,000
TOTAL ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	2,881,000	3,026,000	3,026,000	3,026,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,000,000)	---	---	---
TOTAL BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION	(10,000,000)	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southeastern power administration				
A. Operating and maintenance	2,031,000	2,104,000	2,104,000	2,104,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	19,705,000	25,296,000	25,296,000	25,296,000
C. Use of prior year balances	-2,089,000	---	---	---
TOTAL SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	19,647,000	27,400,000	27,400,000	27,400,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southwestern Power Administration				
A. Operation and maintenance	11,802,000	13,132,000	13,132,000	13,132,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling	20,959,000	11,188,000	11,188,000	11,188,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Construction	5,819,000	5,988,000	5,988,000	5,988,000
Use of prior year balances	-13,243,000	-13,660,000	-13,660,000	-13,660,000
TOTAL SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	25,337,000	16,648,000	16,648,000	16,648,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Western Area Power Administration				
A. Construction and rehabilitation	83,275,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
B. System operation and maintenance	86,100,000	93,000,000	93,000,000	93,000,000
C. Purchase power and wheeling	114,400,000	122,000,000	122,000,000	122,000,000
Unobligated balances	-43,466,000	-4,485,000	-34,485,000	-34,485,000
Transfer from DOI	-3,463,000	-7,003,000	-7,003,000	-7,003,000
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	236,846,000	288,512,000	258,512,000	258,512,000

The recommended limitation on direct loans is the same as recommended by the House. BPA indicates that this level is adequate to carry out its responsibilities as required by law.

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to BPA as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts BPA plans to use of this total and reports an estimate of Bonneville's borrowing requirements.

In addition to the cumulative $2,580,000,000 available to BPA through fiscal year 1987, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $185,200,000 in borrowing authority in fiscal year 1987 for the construction, conservation, and fish and wildlife programs for a total of $2,765,300,000, including any unused portion from prior years.

In making available the additional borrowing authority, the Committee recognizes the agency plans to use a lower funding level consistent with recent program reductions which were made to assist the region in its economic recovery and to hold down rate increases. The Committee supports these efforts.

Repayment.—These recommendations reflect BPA's March 1987 programmatic reductions which were made to assist the region in its economic recovery, and to hold down rate increases. The Committee supports these efforts.

The Committee is pleased with the efforts of BPA to control costs and improve the fiscal condition of the administration. In fiscal year 1986 BPA paid the U.S. Treasury approximately $643,200,000 including $191,500,000 for amortization. At the end of fiscal year 1986 BPA was current in its payments of interest and amortization to the Treasury.

Fish enhancement facilities.—The Committee recommends approval of the administration proposal to construct fish passage improvements at Umatilla River diversions and for the Ellensburg Screen Passage facilities. These projects will provide safe passage for adult and juvenile salmon and steelhead around existing irrigation dams on the Umatilla and Yakima Rivers.

Conservation program.—The Committee recommends borrowing resources for BPA of $55,600,000 which, along with revenues, would allow BPA to finance the conservation program up to a level of $84,600,000. The Committee has been advised that BPA's proposed rate base would support this level of conservation.

Transmission system.—The Committee urges timely completion of the dc terminal expansion project. As indicated in this report last year, the Committee is highly supportive of this project and wishes it to proceed expeditiously.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1987	$19,647,000
Budget estimate, 1988	27,400,000
House allowance	27,400,000
Committee recommendation	27,400,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommendation concurs with the budget request and House action which appropriates $27,400,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration.

The Southeastern Power Administration [SEPA] markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi. There are 22 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092,375 kilowatts.

Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through wheeling arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The fiscal year 1988 budget proposes to study the possible divestiture of SEPA. The recommended appropriation does not provide any funds for this purpose. The Committee reiterates its position that this proposed study and the actual divestiture of Southeastern require the enactment of appropriate authorizing legislation. To date, such legislation has not been enacted.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1987	$25,337,000
Budget estimate, 1988	16,648,000
House allowance	16,648,000
Committee recommendation	16,648,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of $16,648,000. This is the same as the budget request.

The Southwestern Power Administration [SWPA] is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas,

Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquartered in Tulsa, OK, with an operation control center located in Springfield, MO, and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskogee and Ada, OK; Jonesboro, AR; and Springfield, MO.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 23 hydroelectric projects. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,390 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161kV, 138kV and 69kV wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 20 radio and microwave stations, 34 switching stations and substations, with a total installed capacity of 2,150,400 kilowatts.

As of the end of fiscal year 1986, the cumulative Federal investment in SWPA projects totals $934,871,000. Of this, $129,634,000 has been repaid to the Treasury, leaving an unpaid investment of $805,237,000.

The decrease in appropriations for fiscal year 1988 compared to fiscal year 1987 is primarily the result of the availability of unobligated appropriation from fiscal year 1987 and the elimination of duplicative appropriations request by Southwestern and its Department of Defense customers.

Western Area Power Administration

Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance

Appropriations, 1987	$236,846,000
Budget estimate, 1988	288,512,000
House allowance	258,512,000
Committee recommendation	258,512,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−30,000,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $258,512,000, the same as the House allowance and $30,000,000 below the budget request.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance Program of the Western Area Power Administration [WAPA], excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of about 16,000 miles of transmission lines and over 242 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 52 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current installed generating capacity of 8,865,000 kilowatts.

As of the end of fiscal year 1985, the cumulative Federal investment in WAPA projects totals $4,148,000,000. Of this, $1,900,000,000 has

been repaid to the Treasury plus interest totaling $1,300,000,000, leaving an unpaid investment of $2,248,000,000.

The Committee recommendation provides for the same level of activity presented in the budget request for 1988, but adjusts the appropriation to reflect an unanticipated increase in unobligated balances over earlier estimates.

Funds are provided for the transmission line from Tracy, CA, to the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory as requested in the budget. However, the Committee directs that these funds shall not be obligated if, within 60 days of October 1, 1987, an alternate proposal is submitted to the Secretary which is of equal economic benefit to the Federal Government as the budget request, and which resolves in a manner to his satisfaction the considerations of reliability and redundancy set forth in his August 20, 1987, letter to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1987	$99,079,000
Budget estimate, 1988	104,000,000
House allowance	104,000,000
Committee recommendation	104,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

REVENUES APPLIED

Revenues applied, 1987	−$78,754,000
Budget estimate, 1988	
House allowance	−104,000,000
Committee recommendation	−104,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−104,000,000
House allowance	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1987	$20,325,000
Budget estimate, 1988	104,000,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−104,000,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $104,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95–91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the Departmental request.

The fiscal year 1988 budget request for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission provides for a program level of $104,000,000. The administration proposed to treat revenues collected by FERC during fiscal year 1988 as proprietary receipts to the Treasury. The Committee recommendation provides for the same level of activity as the request, but utilizes appropriation language, as was done in fiscal year 1987, to apply the revenues that will be received by FERC to offset the fiscal year 1988 appropriation.

The Committee encourages the Commission to continue its progress in the automation of workload processing and data collection as a means of expediting caseload processing and making more informed decisions.

The Committee has included language in the bill which will help assure that natural gas consumers located in the Northeast region of the United States receive needed additional supplies of natural gas at the lowest possible cost. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's July 24, 1987, "Notice Inviting Applications to Provide New Gas Service to the Northeast United States" assures expeditious Commission consideration of and action on such proposals. Without the temporary and narrow limitation on Commission action established by this language, however, the Iroquois project might be built without regard to their actual need or possible lower cost or less environmentally damaging alternatives, the result of which would be that Northeast gas consumers would not obtain new gas supplies by the most cost-effective system. This provision does not preclude Iroquois from refiling their application utilizing the Commission's standard certificate procedures and having it considered accordingly by the Commission and is not to prejudice any other applications pending under the Commission's optional expedited certificate procedures.

The Committee understands that the Commission has a pending rulemaking on the subject of its NEPA responsibilities and the procedures for fulfilling those responsibilities. The Committee is disturbed, however, by reports that in administering its responsibilities, the Commission does not set time limits on agency staff for making environmental determinations; may seek environmental reviews for completely nonjurisdictional facilities; and that reviews or studies may be required that duplicate actions performed previously for other agencies. The Committee wishes the Commission to focus on these issues in its report. These issues indicate a potential for unwarranted delays and inefficient operation which would be contrary to the efficient use of budgetary

resources of the agency and the industry, which, through fees and annual charges, must pay these costs. Accordingly, the Committee has included language in the bill addressing this matter.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

GEOTHERMAL LOAN GUARANTEE AND INTEREST ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1987	$72,000
Budget estimate, 1988	72,000
House allowance	72,000
Committee recommendation	72,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $72,000. This is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

The Geothermal Loan Guarantee and Interest Assistance Program is authorized under the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–410), as amended by the Department of Energy Act of 1978—Civilian Applications (Public Law 95–238).

The purpose of the program is to accelerate the commercial development and utilization of geothermal energy. Loan guarantees approved under this program are expected to achieve (1) development of normal borrower-lender relationships which, through experience, will encourage the flow of credit without further dependence on Federal financial assistance and (2) enhanced competition to encourage new contracts into the geothermal market.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1987	$105,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	
House allowance	110,000,000
Committee recommendation	110,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+110,000,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends $110,000,000 for Appalachian regional development activities, including salaries and expenses.

The fiscal year 1988 recommendation of $110,000,000 is provided in a single appropriation account. The appropriation finances the full cost of the Office of the Federal Cochairperson and 50 percent of the administrative expenses of the Commission. The action recommended also anticipates the 13 Appalachian States will assume a greater portion of the Commission's administrative budget as the Federal role is reduced.

The Committee recommendation reflects the constraints imposed by the congressional budget resolution and the concern with budget deficits. It should also be noted that the Appalachian Regional Development Act has not been extended by the authorization legislation since fiscal year 1982. In addition, in light of shrinking budget levels, the Appalachian States are cautioned to discontinue their practice of prefinancing the funding of construction of the Appalachian development highways.

The Committee understands that the Commission will continue to carry out programs for development highways and local access roads, stimulation of jobs and private investment, distressed counties, and the local development districts. The Committee urges the ARC to initiate and continue health and human services programs to address regional problems such as school dropouts, high rates of infant mortality, and the problems inhibiting medical services by small rural hospitals and clinics. The use and shipment of Appalachian coal is also encouraged.

The Committee feels that with limited dollars available, Federal programs that support State and local economic development efforts should permit the States to set their own development priorities, fulfill the commitment to developing human capital, encourage innovative strategies as well as a prudent level of support for cost-effective infrastructure projects, and to create an entrepreneurial environment favorable to growth and development.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1987	$185,000
Budget estimate, 1988	203,000
House allowance	203,000
Committee recommendation	203,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $203,000, the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides the full budget estimate for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff in representing interests of the Federal Government in the Delaware River Basin Commission.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1987	$200,000
Budget estimate, 1988	263,000
House allowance	263,000
Committee recommendation	263,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $263,000, which is the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides the full amount requested for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1987	$79,000
Budget estimate, 1988	
House allowance	79,000
Committee recommendation	379,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+ 379,000
House allowance	+ 300,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $379,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the four States in the basin, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, plus the District of Columbia and Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination and assistance.

The Committee has increased the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin appropriation over last year by $300,000 to permit the Commission to work closely with the Corps of Engineers and the States on issues of mutual interest, with flood control receiving primary emphasis.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1987	$401,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	427,800,000
House allowance	417,800,000
Committee recommendation	417,800,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−10,000,000
House allowance	

An appropriation of $417,800,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request.

The Committee recognizes the critical importance of the Nuclear Regulatory Program, including the need to assure the protection of the public health and safety. The Committee is deeply concerned about the safety research activities which have been responsible for providing a sound, technical basis for regulatory decisions.

The matter of dumping contaminated water into the Susquehanna River has been brought to the attention of the Committee. The Committee believes that none of the contaminated water created by the 1979 accident at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Plant should be released into the Susquehanna River, either on a long- or short-term basis. The Committee understands that at least eight other alternatives, all with insignificant environmental impacts, are available for disposition of the contaminated water and directs the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to advise the Committee of this regulatory matter and the alternatives and urges the Commission to approve one of these other methods. The Commission will notify the Committee of their decision.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1987	$179,000
Budget estimate, 1988	197,000
House allowance	197,000
Committee recommendation	197,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends $197,000 for salaries and expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, which is the same as the House allowance.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact (Public Law 91–575) among the States of Maryland and New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to enable them to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries.

This appropriation provides for the expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1987	$240,000
Budget estimate, 1988	249,000
House allowance	249,000
Committee recommendation	249,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $249,000 which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission. The compact provides that the amount required to balance the Commission's current expenses budget shall be apportioned equitably among the signatory parties by unanimous vote of the Commission.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1987	$100,000,000
Budget estimate, 1988	72,773,000
House allowance	105,000,000
Committee recommendation	105,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+32,227,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommendation for the Tennessee Valley Authority totals $105,000,000.

Water Quality Improvement Program.—The Committee has been made aware that a serious water quality problem exists along the Tennessee River and its tributaries. The fragile nature of this resource became all too obvious during the drought of 1986.

Huge volumes of water devoid of oxygen, infestations of noxious aquatic weeds, stressed and diseased fish, dying freshwater mussels, drinking water with objectionable taste and odor, algae blooms and drinking water contaminated with various compounds were all documented during the record-setting drought in the Tennessee Valley.

While these problems occurred throughout the Tennessee Valley, almost all were prevalent at Kentucky Reservoir where they were least expected. During 1986, water quality in Kentucky Reservoir became a major problem in the area. The value of the reservoir to the region's economy and the urgency with which the public views these issues makes it necessary that special attention and efforts be given to solving the water quality problems in this reservoir.

Yet, the water quality situation is complex. Urban runoff, agricultural nonpoint source pollution, industrial pollution, drought, and other factors all contribute to the critical conditions which exist in many TVA reservoirs. TVA will not be able to solve the problem without increased help and interest on the part of State and local officials.

While the roles and responsibilities for improving the quality of water in TVA's reservoirs will require action at all levels, the Tennessee Valley Authority still has the responsibility to provide the leadership and direction critical to addressing the problem. Further, given the integrated nature of TVA activities, poor water quality has an adverse impact on TVA's economic development strategy. The Committee, therefore, urges the TVA to give a higher priority to improving the water quality of its reservoirs, especially Kentucky Lake. Based on testimony presented to the Committee, $8,200,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over the current year, is included for water quality improvement activities. The Committee directs the TVA to reflect this priority work within the total budget amount recommended.

Northeast Mississippi water supply.—TVA is to prepare a plan for the water supply requirements in northeast Mississippi in connection with the development of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and report to the Committees on Appropriations.

National Sport Fishing Center, Chattanooga, TN.—To assure that the National Sport Fishing Center, being developed in Chattanooga, TN, realizes the maximum potential contribution to the Nation's body of knowledge regarding its inland game fishery, as well as the development of the natural and economic resources of the Tennessee Valley region, the Tennessee Valley Authority is directed to provide in fiscal year 1988 technical assistance to the center, particularly in the areas of fisheries biology, recreation and tourism development, and to submit a fiscal year 1989 budget request in support of center construction.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading:

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1987 program	1988 budget request	1988 recommendation
CAPITAL INVESTMENT			
Columbia Dam and Reservoir	183		
Dam safety modifications	5,731	2,610	2,610
Additions and improvements	1,835	2,312	1,832
Land and forest resources			25
Land Between the Lakes facilities	90	100	95
Fertilizer test facilities	4,438	4,037	4,424
North Alabama coal-to-methanol project	1,052		
General facilities	1,670	1,611	1,423
Total, capital investment	14,999	10,670	10,409
OPERATING EXPENSES			
Natural resources:			
Water resources	7,300	2,500	7,452
Reservoir system operations	22,307	21,222	22,975
Land and forest resources	3,700	550	3,780
Resource management and development support	4,475	2,455	4,495
Land Between the Lakes	6,250	5,900	6,380
Total, natural resources	44,032	32,627	45,082
Economic resources	11,770		14,413
Agricultural resources development	4,252	3,636	4,067
National fertilizer development:			
Fertilizer research	16,605	13,050	16,632
Technology introduction	10,700	9,000	10,878
Ammonia from coal process	371		
Hardwood research and testing	2,880	3,000	2,929
Total, national fertilizer development	30,556	25,050	30,239
General services	1,044	790	790
Total, operating expenses	91,654	62,013	90,878
Jobs bill (Public Law 98-8)	2		
Total, appropriations	106,655	72,773	105,000
FINANCING			
Appropriations	100,000	72,773	105,000
Unobligated balance brought forward	6,655		
Total, financing	106,655	72,773	105,000

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The following items of appropriations recommended by the Committee, not made to carry out the provisions of existing law or an act passed by the Senate in this session, are brought to the attention of the Senate in accordance with rule XVI, paragraph 7.

On page 11, under Department of Defense—Civil, Corps of Engineers—Civil, Construction, General, $2,500,000 is to be made available for metropolitan Dade County, FL.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

The accompanying act would amend section 4(c) of Public Law 99–469 as follows:

PAYMENTS TO TRIBE; LIMITS ON SECRETARY'S LIABILITY

SEC. 4. (a) If the tribe executes the waiver and release referred to in section 6(a)(1) and the grant of rights referred to in section 6(a)(2), the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the authorized governing body of the tribe the sum of $6,000,000 for the benefit of the tribe, together with interest accruing on such sum from the date of enactment of this Act at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the average market yield on Federal obligations of comparable maturity.

(b) The tribe shall invest sums received under this section in interest bearing deposits and securities until expended. The authorized governing body of the tribe may spend the principal and interest and dividends accruing on such sums for economic and community development and other tribal purposes: *Provided*, That the sum of $100,000 shall be distributed by the tribe, on a fair and equitable basis, among those six individuals who were heads of households residing at Tat Momoli village in 1969 and owned improvements at said village, or among their heirs. No portion of the funds received under subsection (a) shall be used for per capita payments.

(c) The [Secretary] *United States* shall not be responsible for the review, approval or audit of the moneys referred to in this section, nor shall the [Secretary] *United States* be subject to liability for any claim or cause of action arising from the Tribe's use and expenditure of such moneys.

The act would amend section 1124 of Public Law 99–662, the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 as follows:

SEC. 1124. SOURIS RIVER BASIN.

(a)(1) On behalf of the United States, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to cooperate with governments in Canada to study and to construct reservoir projects for storage in the Souris River Basin in Canada to provide flood control benefits in the United States.

(2) The Secretary is authorized further to participate in financing the storage referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection to a maximum contribution of $26,700,000, in the event that only one reservoir, known as the Rafferty project, is constructed in Canada, or to a maximum of $41,100,000, in the event two reservoirs, known as the Rafferty and Alameda projects, are constructed in Canada. The amount of any such contribution shall be determined by an allocation of costs, based on the proportionate use of these projects for flood control in the United States and water supply in Canada.

(b) Upon completion of the structure or structures in Canada, as agreed upon between the United States and governments in Canada, the construction of Burlington Dam, North Dakota, as authorized by Public Law 91–611, and modifications at Lake Darling, North Dakota, to raise the level of the dam structure, as authorized by section 111 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1982 (Public Law 97–88; 95 Stat. 1138), shall no longer be authorized. Should the Secretary determine that an agreement between the United States and governments in Canada cannot be consummated, he shall proceed with the work authorized by section 111 of such Act, including raising the dam structure and including storage capacity for flood control purposes, with such work to be considered a nonseparable element of the flood control project for

Minot, North Dakota, authorized under section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965.

(c) The Secretary is authorized further to make such modifications as necessary to the existing Lake Darling, exclusive of the modifications authorized by section 111 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1982, for the purpose of effective operation of the project for flood control, with such work considered to be a nonseparable element of the flood control project for Minot, North Dakota, authorized under section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965, and to operate and maintain the project with such modifications in a manner compatible with the migratory waterfowl refuge purpose of the project.

(d) The non-Federal share of the cost of contributions to governments in Canada, as authorized by this section, shall be in accordance with title I of this Act for the amount over $23,600,000. The total Federal cost of work authorized by this section and by section 3111 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, 1982, as modified herein, and including related dam safety measures, is $69,100,000.

(e) The dollar amounts listed in this section are based on October 1985 price levels. Such amount shall be subject to adjustment pursuant to section 902(2) of this Act. Total contributions to governments in Canada that are authorized by this section, as adjusted pursuant to section 902(2) of this Act, may fluctuate to reflect changes in the rate of exchange for currency between the United States and Canada that occurred between October 1985 and the time contributions are made.

The accompanying act would amend section 401(a) of Public Law 99–662 as follows:

PUERCO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NEW MEXICO

The project for flood control, Puerco River and Tributaries, Gallup, New Mexico: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated September 4, 1981, at a total cost of [$4,190,000] $7,300,000, with an estimated first Federal cost of [$3,140,000] $5,500,000 and an estimated first non-Federal cost of [$1,050,000] $1,800,000.

In addition, the act would amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, Public Law 97–425, by incorporating S. 1668, Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments Act. However, the opinion of the Committee, the printing of the text of Public Law 97–425 has been dispensed with in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1988: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development	16.20	15,920	16.08	[1] 15,926
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1988				[2] 10,113
1989				4,816
1990				864
1991				102
1992 and future year				25
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1988 in the bill		106		5
	Direct loans		Loan guarantees	
Credit authority estimates, fiscal year 1988	0.04	29		

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1987	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1988	Increase or decrease
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$10,885,000	$9,000,000	-$1,885,000
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations	280,000	287,000	+7,000
Department of Energy:			
Colorado River dam fund, Boulder Canyon project	50,600,000	55,814,000	+5,214,000
Payments to States under Federal Power Act	705,000	727,000	+22,000
Continuing fund, Western Area Power Administration	225,000		-225,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation, and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	3,463,000	7,003,000	+3,540,000
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	327,659,000	205,800,000	-121,859,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	1,449,600,000	212,700,000	-1,236,900,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	1,843,417,000	491,331,000	-1,352,086,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Rivers and harbors contributed funds	237,000,000	250,000,000	+13,000,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	34,970,000	48,000,000	+13,030,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work	149,802,000	138,200,000	-11,602,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust funds	3,500,000	1,024,000	-2,476,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	425,272,000	437,224,000	+11,952,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1987 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1987 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	136,287,000	133,000,000	148,712,000	141,450,000	+5,163,000	+8,450,000	-7,262,000
Construction, general	1,152,150,000	1,188,000,000	1,150,142,000	1,166,136,000	+13,986,000	-21,864,000	+15,994,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	10,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	+16,000,000	---	---
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	310,797,000	317,000,000	326,399,000	315,130,000	+4,333,000	-1,870,000	-11,269,000
Operation and maintenance, general 1/	1,389,846,000	1,414,738,000	1,412,593,000	1,404,738,000	+14,892,000	-10,000,000	-7,855,000
General Regulatory Functions	---	55,262,000	55,262,000	55,262,000	+55,262,000	---	---
Revolving Fund	12,000,000	---	---	---	-12,000,000	---	---
General expenses	115,000,000	128,200,000	128,200,000	128,200,000	+13,200,000	---	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil: New budget (obligational) authority	3,126,080,000	3,262,200,000	3,247,308,000	3,236,916,000	+110,836,000	-25,284,000	-10,392,000

1/ Reflects transfer of $55,262,000 to "General Regulatory Functions".

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1987 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1987 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations	29,409,000	11,559,000	17,795,000	16,945,000	-12,464,000	+5,386,000	-850,000
Construction program	602,158,000	700,158,000	704,233,000	699,038,000	+96,880,000	-1,120,000	-5,195,000
Operation and maintenance	140,000,000	154,297,000	154,797,000	154,297,000	+14,297,000	---	-500,000
Loan program	37,480,000	28,809,000	41,574,000	30,809,000	-6,671,000	+2,000,000	-10,765,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(43,806,000)	(27,472,000)	(40,237,000)	(29,472,000)	(-14,334,000)	(+2,000,000)	(-10,765,000)
General administrative expenses	51,200,000	53,290,000	53,290,000	53,690,000	+2,490,000	+400,000	+400,000
Emergency fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	---
Working Capital fund	6,400,000	---	---	---	-6,400,000	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	867,647,000	949,113,000	972,689,000	955,779,000	+88,132,000	+6,666,000	-16,910,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior:							
New budget (obligational) authority	867,647,000	949,113,000	972,689,000	955,779,000	+88,132,000	+6,666,000	-16,910,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(43,806,000)	(27,472,000)	(40,237,000)	(29,472,000)	(-14,334,000)	(+2,000,000)	(-10,765,000)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,048,876,000	1,677,317,000	1,742,567,000	1,775,814,000	+726,938,000	+98,497,000	+33,247,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	287,055,000	232,393,000	310,693,000	280,393,000	-6,662,000	+48,000,000	-30,300,000
Subtotal	1,335,931,000	1,909,710,000	2,053,260,000	2,056,207,000	+720,276,000	+146,497,000	+2,947,000

Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,187,600,000	1,018,500,000	1,128,793,000	1,082,000,000	-105,600,000	+63,500,000	-46,793,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	22,800,000	51,500,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	+11,200,000	-17,500,000	---
Subtotal	1,210,400,000	1,070,000,000	1,162,793,000	1,116,000,000	-94,400,000	+46,000,000	-46,793,000
Gross revenues	-1,286,400,000	---	-1,301,000,000	-1,301,000,000	-14,600,000	-1,301,000,000	---
Net appropriation	-76,000,000	1,070,000,000	-138,207,000	-185,000,000	-109,000,000	-1,255,000,000	-46,793,000
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses	578,142,000	627,423,000	627,423,000	637,423,000	+59,281,000	+10,000,000	+10,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	141,375,000	187,075,000	178,575,000	187,075,000	+45,700,000	---	+8,500,000
Subtotal	719,517,000	814,498,000	805,998,000	824,498,000	+104,981,000	+10,000,000	+18,500,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	499,000,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	360,000,000	-139,000,000	-140,000,000	-140,000,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activites:							
Operating Expenses	6,013,342,000	6,408,165,000	6,291,065,000	6,251,065,000	+237,723,000	-157,100,000	-40,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,468,510,000	1,641,835,000	1,522,219,000	1,498,299,000	+29,789,000	-143,536,000	-23,920,000
Subtotal	7,481,852,000	8,050,000,000	7,813,284,000	7,749,364,000	+267,512,000	-300,636,000	-63,920,000
Departmental Administration:							
Operating Expenses	383,268,000	394,156,000	392,640,000	419,322,000	+36,054,000	+25,166,000	+26,682,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	8,188,000	5,873,000	5,873,000	5,873,000	-2,315,000	---	---
Subtotal	391,456,000	400,029,000	398,513,000	425,195,000	+33,739,000	+25,166,000	+26,682,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-251,947,000	-233,896,000	-233,896,000	-233,896,000	+18,051,000	---	---
Net appropriation	139,509,000	166,133,000	164,617,000	191,299,000	+51,790,000	+25,166,000	+26,682,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1987 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1987 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	2,881,000	3,026,000	3,026,000	3,026,000	+145,000	---	---
Bonneville Power Administration Fund:							
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,000,000)	---	---	---	(-10,000,000)	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	19,647,000	27,400,000	27,400,000	27,400,000	+7,753,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	25,337,000	16,648,000	16,648,000	16,648,000	-8,689,000	---	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	236,846,000	288,512,000	258,512,000	258,512,000	+21,666,000	-30,000,000	---
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(3,463,000)	(7,003,000)	(7,003,000)	(7,003,000)	(+3,540,000)	---	---
Subtotal	284,711,000	335,586,000	305,586,000	305,586,000	+20,875,000	-30,000,000	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	99,079,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	104,000,000	+4,921,000	---	---
Revenues Applied	-78,754,000	---	-104,000,000	-104,000,000	-25,246,000	-104,000,000	---
Subtotal	20,325,000	104,000,000	- -	---	-20,325,000	-104,000,000	---
Geothermal Resources Development Fund							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	72,000	72,000	72,000	72,000	---	---	---

Total, title III, Department of Energy:							
New budget (obligational) authority	10,404,917,000	12,949,999,000	11,504,610,000	11,302,026,000	+897,109,000	-1,647,973,000	-202,584,000
Operating Expenses	(8,476,989,000)	(10,831,323,000)	(9,453,250,000)	(9,296,386,000)	(+819,397,000)	(-1,534,937,000)	(-156,864,000)
Plant and Capital Equipment	(1,927,928,000)	(2,118,676,000)	(2,051,360,000)	(2,005,640,000)	(+77,712,000)	(-113,036,000)	(-45,720,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,000,000)	---	---	---	(-10,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
(By transfer)	(3,463,000)	(7,003,000)	(7,003,000)	(7,003,000)	(+3,540,000)	---	---
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission:							
Appalachian regional development programs	105,000,000	---	110,000,000	110,000,000	+5,000,000	+110,000,000	---
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	185,000	203,000	203,000	203,000	+18,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	200,000	263,000	263,000	263,000	+63,000	---	---
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	385,000	466,000	466,000	466,000	+81,000	---	---
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:							
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	79,000	---	79,000	379,000	+300,000	+379,000	+300,000
National Council on Public Works Improvements:							
Salaries and expenses	1,750,000	---	---	---	-1,750,000	---	---
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	401,000,000	427,800,000	417,800,000	417,800,000	+16,800,000	-10,000,000	---
Revenues	---	---	-208,900,000	-208,900,000	-208,900,000	-208,900,000	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	401,000,000	427,800,000	208,900,000	208,900,000	-192,100,000	-218,900,000	---
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	179,000	197,000	197,000	197,000	+18,000	---	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	240,000	249,000	249,000	249,000	+9,000	---	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	419,000	446,000	446,000	446,000	+27,000	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1987 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					1987 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Tennessee Valley Authority:							
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	100,000,000	72,773,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	+5,000,000	+32,227,000	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies:							
New budget (obligational) authority	608,633,000	501,485,000	424,891,000	425,191,000	-183,442,000	-76,294,000	+300,000
Grand total, all titles:							
New budget (obligational) authority	15,007,277,000	17,662,797,000	16,149,498,000	15,919,912,000	+912,635,000	-1,742,885,000	-229,586,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(53,806,000)	(27,472,000)	(40,237,000)	(29,472,000)	(-24,334,000)	(+2,000,000)	(-10,765,000)
(By transfer)	(3,463,000)	(7,003,000)	(7,003,000)	(7,003,000)	(+3,540,000)	---	---